Universität Zürich[UZH]

Choosing a surname of her own: non(neo)-traditional femininities in contemporary Lithuania

Thesis
presented to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
of the University of Zurich
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by
Ieva Bisigirskaitė

Accepted in the fall semester 2020
on the recommendation of the doctoral committee composed of
Prof. Dr. Sylvia Sasse (main supervisor) and Prof. Dr. Katrin Meyer

Zurich, 2021

Abstract

The Lithuanian language possesses a system of female surnames derived from male surnames (father's or husband's) by adding various suffixes to them. The surname of daughters are traditionally built by using the suffixes *-ait-, -yt-, -ut-, -(i)ūt* and an ending *-ė* attached to the stem of a father's surname. The surname of married women is built using the suffix *-(uv)ien-* with an ending *-ė* added to the stem of a husband's surname. Having one's marital status as an integral part of one's social identity is a form of biopower that, predictably, can cause all kinds of discriminative tensions. Consequently, in 2003, instigated by a group of feminist activists, the *State Commission of the Lithuanian Language* adopted a decision to legitimize non-suffixed female surnames to be used alongside traditional suffixed female surnames. Positioned within the field of Gender and Cultural studies, this thesis presents findings from a qualitative study of the narratives of self-naming by Lithuanian women who obtained non-suffixed surnames. Regardless of the fact that the new surname is closely connected to a feminist campaign that promoted the introduction of an alternative surname that would eliminate the gendered asymmetry inscribed within this traditional naming convention, both ethnographic observations and women's individual accounts reveal that, so far, the new linguistic tool is largely being used to construct new forms of marital female identities.

Through mapping the context of both historical and contemporary discourses concerned with the question of Lithuanian female surnames, this study argues that traditional family names of women have been assigned a sacred place within the Lithuanian ethnolinguistic nationalist narrative and are, thus, closely intertwined with hegemonic representations of appropriate femininity. The new surname, thus, poses a double threat to the nationalist discourse of language preservation as well as the perpetuation of male privilege ingrained within patronymic naming conventions.

However, notwithstanding the feminist political agenda behind the suffix reform, accounts of women who have obtained non-suffixed marital surnames reveal an intense intergenerational conflict where the traditionally suffixed family name is perceived as representing semantically overloaded feminine identities often represented by the figure of

the mother-in-law. Consequently, this study argues that, embedded in discursive paradigms of *individual choice, aesthetic preference, heterosexual imaginary*, and *global dispositions* Lithuanian women's narratives of self-naming extensively rely on gendered configurations of neoliberal capitalism as a symbolic depository for their identity work. Using the concept of *postfeminism* as a novel analytic category in language and gender research, this thesis argues that the new surname is used as a tool in producing new femininities in postsocialist Lithuania both at macro *and* micro levels of subject formation. As these new femininities discursively construct individualized, youthful heteronormative marital identities, symbolically disconnected from other female figures of extended family, they convey a postcolonial desire to construct heteronormative Western femininities that project animosity towards dull, ageing, Soviet female bodies.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to thank all the women who participated in this study by sharing their naming story with me.

Second, I want to thank the Doctoral Program Gender Studies for the opportunity to carry out this research and for all the financial and administrative support I have received. I especially want to thank Prof. Therese Steffen - a former coordinator of the doctoral program - for her unprecedented commitment and genuine support. And to the University of Zurich for the *Forschungskredit* scholarship I have received (2015 to 2018).

I am grateful to my supervisors: Prof. Sylvia Sasse for her trust and encouragement and to Prof. Katrin Meyer for valuable comments on the manuscript.

I also want to thank members of Slavic Department at the University of Zurich for their comments and critique on different parts of this work.

Zurich has gifted me with new friendships. Megan McDowell, Nina Seiler, Anna Engler, Sabine Binder, Nastasia Louveau, Deniz Yüksel, Ayşe Zeynep Pamuk Suleri, Gianna Frölicher, Serena Di Palma, you are all strong and talented women and I am proud of each and every one of you.

Special thanks go to Macarena Garcia-Gonzalez, who has always pushed me to dream big. To Sarah Farag for all the time spent discussing ideas, kids and academia. To Neslihan Demirkol for the gift of her friendship and for her indispensable help in editing parts of this dissertation.

I also want to say a big thank you to Anna Pigott for copy-editing this work.

Grazie mille to my loud and loving Italian family in Puglia.

I am grateful to my brother Matas and Vaida for their unending love, support, and humour.

I am blessed to have my Mother and my Father who continue to endow me with their loving presence.

I want to thank my two amazing children - Ona and Simas - for teaching me everything about love, commitment and discipline.

This thesis is dedicated to my husband Giancarlo whose generous love, dedication, and unfailing support made this study possible.

For Giancarlo

Introduction

In 2005, Natalija Zvonkė née Natalija Ivanova - the leader of the (then) popular pop band YVA - became one of the most talked-about women in Lithuania due to her choice of an unusual family name following her eccentric wedding to the Lithuanian music producer Deivydas Zvonkus. What caused public outrage and, often, ridicule was her decision to appropriate the new form of a female surname that had been only recently approved following a political campaign led by a few feminist activists. This choice made her one of the most visible women associated with the new surname. So much so that, according to the Lithuanian media[1], it was her new feminine identity that caused the initiation of a widely discussed petition to the Parliament (*Seimas*) of the Republic of Lithuania, signed by a group of prominent public figures asking to ban the new surname[2] in 2009 altogether. It could be argued that the visibility of this public persona did a disservice to the feminist political agenda behind the new surname, given that Natalija Zvonkė used her new marital surname to both construct her marital identity and establish a new stage name. This, arguably, had depoliticizing effects (Litosseliti et al. 2019) regarding how the new surname has since been perceived within Lithuanian society.

Similarly to some other European languages,[3] traditional Lithuanian surnames of women have different feminine forms that are constructed from masculine surnames (Walkowiak 2016; Ramonienė 2007). Besides having different gendered endings (usually *-us, -as, -is* for men and *-ė* for women), traditional Lithuanian *female* surnames also indicate the marital status of the woman by adding a list of specific suffixes. So-called maiden surnames are derived from the surname of the father by attaching a suffix *-ait-, -yt-, -ut-, -(i)ūt-* and married women usually obtain their husband's surname with added suffix *-ien-* (Garšva 2012). It is easy to predict that having one's marital status as an integral part of one's social identity causes all kinds of discriminative tensions. For example, Virginija Jūrėnienė describes the tangibility of contemporary social discrimination in the labor market, where

[1] Gudavičiūtė, Dalia. "Turėti pavardę be priesagos yra nepadoru?" *Lietuvos Rytas,* 30 Apr. 2009, www.pasaulis.lrytas.lt/marga-planeta/2009/04/30/news/tureti-pavarde-be-priesagos-yra-nepadoru--5808526/ [accessed 14 June, 2015]
[2] The petition is analyzed extensively in Part II of this thesis.
[3] Such as Czech, Slovak, Polish, Russian or Latvian.

"[y]oung women till 30 with a family name with the suffix of a married woman *-ien-* are viewed with suspicion because the possibility of maternity leave or absence from work due to child care is very high. On the other hand, women around 35-40 and above with a maiden family name are also viewed with certain suspicion, questioning her character and the ability to get along with other people, leaving her competence and qualification aside when making a decision to hire" (2010: 5). Consequently, built around the discourse of gender inequality and potential discrimination in the job market, public discussions initiated by a group of Lithuanian feminists focused on a renegotiation of social meanings that traditional suffixes have the capacity to stabilize. "Western" second wave feminism is often seen as the most active critic of the patronymic custom[4] (Thwaites 2017a; see also Rubin 1975). However, traditional Lithuanian naming practices impose a double edged gendered asymmetry as they are built on patrilineal expectations *as well as* semantically disclosing a woman's situated relationality to male family members - usually either the father or the husband. Importantly, and in contrast to "Western" second wave feminism, the Lithuanian feminists' critique did not challenge patrilineal expectations of marital naming or the patronymic custom to name children after their father.

Consequently, from 2003, women who carry surnames ending with *-ienė* as well as *-ytė; -aitė; -utė* can now get rid of the feminizing suffix, retaining only an ending *-ė*, which shows grammatical female gender, but eliminates information regarding a woman's marital status. One of the most visible feminism campaigns in postsocialist Lithuania (Čepaitienė in Mikonytė 2011: 33), this initiative was followed by a hostile backlash (Faludi 2006) against women who chose to obtain this new neutralising form of their surname. In 2009, fifteen famous Lithuanian scientists, writers and social figures (thirteen of them being men) signed an appeal to the speaker of the Lithuanian Parliament encouraging them to forbid this new practice, the main argument being that the new surname carries associations to leading an amoral and dishonorable life[5]. They were praising the unique and exceptional Lithuanian

[4] Patrilineal tradition - an expectation that a woman takes her husband's family name after marriage while a man gets to keep his. Patronymic tradition usually refers to giving father's patronym to the children (Pilcher 2016). However, some studies refer to both of these phenomena as patronymic custom (Rom and Benjamin 2011). In my study, there is more emphasis on the patrilineal custom as it is mostly concerned with women's marital self-naming.

[5] Digrytė, Eglė. "Grupė kultūrininkų ir lituanistų: neutrali moters pavardė rodo amoralų gyvenimą," *Delfi,* April 29, 2009,

language and claimed that family names with the suffix *-ienė* demonstrate sacred belonging to the family, fidelity, and close family bonds.

While this campaign did not succeed in eliminating the modern amendment in the system of Lithuanian family names, it was followed by a media backlash as many newspaper articles appeared stating that, statistically, it had become clear that women were not inclined towards the modern family names as only 10 to 15 percent of brides tend to choose neutral surnames every year[6]. Furthermore, some critics suggested that Irena Smetonienė, the (then) director of the State Commission of the Lithuanian Language, was protecting feminist ideology instead of cherishing the native language[7].

As more women with non-traditional family names started to sporadically appear both in my private circles as well in the public domain, I became interested in their motives of choosing a surname that - it was clear from the public discussions - had been turned into a site of cultural and ideological tensions due to its associations with feminist politics *and* for the symbolic injury it had caused to the Lithuanian language. Scholars of post-socialist gender formations have documented that an intense negativity towards Western feminist ideology is common in post-communist societies (Ghodsee 2004; Occhipinti 1996). Therefore, the declaration of the failure of this linguistic reform in 2009 did not come as a surprise. Assuming that feminist sentiments serve as dominant motives for these unconventional naming practices, I - too - was not expecting that this new form of self-naming would drastically reshape the landscape of contemporary Lithuanian women's naming practices.

However, what I had noticed in my earliest empirical observations is that many of the women who opted for the non-conventional surname, had decided to obtain a hyphenated version of their family name where the non-suffixed surname of a husband would often be added next to their birth surname. As a growing number of these feminine visibilities

https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/grupe-kulturininku-ir-lituanistu-neutrali-moters-pavarde-rodo-amoralu-gyvenima.d?id=21886326

[6] "Būti -iene vis dar madinga," *Kauno diena,* June 6, 2010, https://kauno.diena.lt/naujienos/salies-pulsas/buti-iene-vis-dar-madinga-224753

[7] Digrytė, Eglė. "Kalbininko siūlymas moterims: imti pavardę su priesaga arba natekėti," *Delfi,* May 6, 2009, https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/kalbininko-siulymas-moterims-imti-pavarde-su-priesaga-arba-neteketi.d?id=21990522

demonstrates[8], hyphenated surnames inevitably reveal the marital information of a woman by containing a surname they have inherited from their father as well as the surname of their current spouse. Even though their second surname does not consist of the traditional marital suffix, the linear nature of these family names provides information of a woman's kin relationships to one man and of her marital relationship to another. As I watched former classmates, colleagues and friends attach non-suffixed forms of their husbands' surname to their last names, I was baffled and intrigued by the ambiguity their self-naming practices were manifesting. It was clear that the initial feminist agenda to withhold the information of woman's marital status was being undermined by these choices. And that the problem, as my subsequent research into the narratives of these women has suggested, lies not in the discriminatory nature of the traditional surname per se, but in the traditional suffix *-ienė* that generally defines a married woman. So it is by contemplating the ambiguity of these hyphenated surnames that the speculation of neo-traditional self-naming practices emerged. In this thesis, I aim to capture and analyse this process of cultural resignification of marital female identities that, while using the tools provided by feminist political activism, nevertheless adheres to the structural asymmetry inscribed in patrilineal naming regimes.

While the feminist in me felt disappointed by the popularity of these choices, the researcher in me wanted to figure out what these choices - hardly anticipated by the authors of the suffix reform - have to say about historically and culturally situated female identities. To be more precise, given the troubled nature of the new surname due to its affiliations to feminist political discourse as well as its perceived violation of the untouchable component of the Lithuanian language, I was interested in the discursive resources women rely on in constructing their self-naming stories and what their rhetoric choices can say about postsocialist gender formations in general.

In light of this, the thesis aims to demonstrate ideological, cultural and subjective reactions to the suffix reform that have emerged in Lithuania following the introduction of the non-suffixed female surname. While analysing both public and private narratives of self-naming produced by Lithuanian women who have obtained an *-ė* surname, I argue in

[8] Jurgita Jurkutė-Širvaitė, Živilė Kropaitė-Basiulė, Daiva Tamošiūnaitė-Budrė, Karina Krysko-Skambinė to name just a few

this thesis that individualizing discourses of *personal choice* and *aesthetic preference* as well as discursive celebration of *heterosexual imaginary* and the presence of *global dispositions* are extensively employed by contemporary women when negotiating their troubled identities (Taylor and Littleton 2006). Thus I argue that they position the new ending *-ė* as a linguistic tool that enables the production of new and postfeminist forms of marital femininities in postsocialist Lithuania.

According to scholars of postfeminism, one characteristic of contemporary gender regimes is a discursive undoing of feminist ideology "whereby feminism is taken *into account* and asserted as common sense yet simultaneously feared and repudiated" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). In this thesis, I use a postfeminist sensibility (Gill 2007) as an analytical framework for investigating how the new "feminist" surname has been been embraced by contemporary Lithuanian women in constructing their social identities. When it comes to marital naming, feminism is often seen "as a force which breaks down tradition" (Thwaites 2017a: 64). In this work, I build upon (Western second wave) feminist critique of traditional practices of marital naming as "a logic outgrowth of patriarchy and the acceptance of male priority and priviledge" (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660). Following this line, I question to what extent the "feminist" surname in Lithuania can be seen as breaking down the traditional pattern of naming practices and argue that the way the new surname has been used so far by Lithuanian women indicates an appearance of neo-traditional femininities. The originality of this work then lies 1) in its interest in the motives of women who have embraced the new surname, 2) in its application of postfeminism in gender and language research (Litosseliti et al. 2019), and 3) in its investment in expanding existing geographies of postfeminist knowledge production.

I adopt the concept of *femininities* from the field of cultural and gender studies for its investment into the questions "about the ways in which gender is lived, experienced and represented" (Gill and Scharff 2011: 2). Extensively employed by scholars of contemporary postfeminist culture, whose work provides an interpretative framework for this thesis, this concept "highlights the *social production and construction of gender*" (original italics) (Gill and Scharff 2011: 2) and is effective in capturing the psychosocial dimension of non-traditionally named identities. As surnames of women are at the centre of this thesis, the

notion of *social identity* is also important in that it articulates situated memberships (McConnell-Ginet 2003: 71) or, in other words, stabilizes meanings of gendered individuals in particular social relations. *Subjectivity,* following a Foucauldian approach, is produced through practices of power both in a form of governmentality and a more subtle "governing [of] the soul" (Rose 1999) which "becomes internalised in such a way that it activates [certain] feelings" (McAvoy 2015: 23). As I maintain that narratives of self-naming of Lithuanian women is a discursive domain in which gendered subjectivities are negotiated, I rely on the notion of femininities in analysing these constructions in relation to situated cultural practices. Consequently, I argue that the new marital femininity that can be deduced from women's narratives of non-traditional self-naming is performatively detached from other familial histories and embodiments of traditional marital femininities and, in turn, sees female marital surnames as a trademark for individualized family units built on the heteronormative romantic coupledom culture. Furthermore, neoliberal discourse or, following the work of scholars of postfeminism (Gill 2007; 2017; also McRobbie 2013; 2009), contemporary cultural repertoires of gendered neoliberalism, serve as a semantic glue in re-establish the intelligibility of these new femininities. This questions altogether the "putative newness" (Gill and Scharff 2011: 2) of the notion of "new femininities" inscribed in the title of this thesis and suggests a neo-traditional nature of these practices.

To sum up, within the public discourse, the new surnames were turned into a discursive battlefield with the ethno-linguistic nationalist narrative on the one hand and the feminist political narrative addressing gendered imbalances within the Lithuanian patrilineal tradition on the other. However, as this thesis will demonstrate, closer investigations suggest that Lithuanian women who have - at some point in their life - chosen the non-traditional surname, convey numerous narratives that are, in most cases, inconsistent with the dominant ones and, thus, complicates the simplistic positioning of women's naming choices "as either resistance or accomodation" (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 44).

Positioning the research

According to Anthony Giddens (1991), our self-identity is a reflexive project that requires constant rearticulation of our personal biographies. Anchored to spatial and temporal progression, it demands routine integration of external events into an ongoing personal story. Personal names are one of those primary elements which our identities consist of (Giddens 1991: 55). It goes without saying that a change of a name calls for major reinvention of the *self*. For Giddens, our ability to reflect our biographies and to communicate them to others is one of the essential dimensions of what he calls *ontological security* of a person (Giddens 1991). But how is one to maintain ontological security when it comes to reflecting and communicating changes in biography that are perceived as contradictory within one's social reality? How different is one's personal story about a name change from the one that is communicated to the others? And is it always the same regardless of the circumstances in which it is being told?

While Giddens admits that the fragility of our self-identities lies within the potential multiplicity of our biographies,[9] he maintains that we seek continuity and integrity as they are essential to our existential need "to keep a particular narrative going" (Giddens 1991: 54). Names are first and foremost a gendered category (Pilcher 2017; Pilcher 2016; Alford 1987) and marital self-naming is a widespread cultural phenomenon that calls women to change, negotiate or fight for their gender identity[10]. Therefore, built around the idea that coherence is essential to our perception of the self, this thesis reads discursive constructions about self-naming of Lithuanian women as biographical accounts about their social identity. Given their engagement with highly contested notions of gender/national identities, this thesis questions which *interpretative repertoires* (Edley 2001) are employed in their accounts and how these discursive constructions manage to solve *ideological dilemmas* (Edley 2001) while simultaneously positioning oneself as an agentic subject.

[9] As Taylor and Littleton underline, due to the "social nature of resources" identity work is always constrained and, thus, speakers cannot "construct and claim any identity they want" (Taylor and Littleton 2006: 32).
[10] As well as ethical, national, racial and familial identities (Rom and Benjamin 2011).

Names, social identity and power

This thesis follows a well established post-structuralist assumption, i.e. *language* is a place where social meanings are constructed and contested (Baxter 2003). While "[t]here is no social agent who does not aspire [...] to have the power to name and to create the world through naming" (Bourdieu 1991: 105), naming is one of the linguistic sites where the power struggle over one's desire to create social worlds takes place. Official naming is one example of how the state - as the "holder of legitimate symbolic violence" - institutionalizes certain taxonomies (Bourdieu 1991: 239). Depending on historical context, its power over individuals can be expressed as much by compulsory legitimization[11] as by stripping them of their value by withholding names (Ragussis 1986: 225; see also Alia 2007)[12]. At the core of this process lies the power struggle of an individual (or a group of individuals (Alia 2007)) who is/are aiming to maintain control over their social identity. Depending on the sociocultural context and the multiple social meanings that the name produces, the power struggle between individuals and their social environment rests on a continuous redefining of how an individual (or a group of individuals) will be visible/known/legible *as;* that is, there is a perpetual struggle over the constitution of social meanings.

According to Richard Jenkins, social identity, which is also a product of naming among other social elements, is a cognitive process of classification, which relies on the constructions or attributions of similarity and difference (Jenkins 2008 et al.) and, therefore, a strategically significant tool "for social theoretical debates about [...] the relationship between the individual and the collective" (16). Jane Caplan elaborates on the double burden of the term identity, emphasizing the tension between "identity" as individualizing *self-sameness* and "identity" as classifying *sameness with another* (2001: 51). Nowhere this dualistic mechanism of identity formation is better illustrated than within our personal names that clearly demonstrate how one's name is a signifier of both individual and collective identity (Jenkins 2008: 21).

[11] As it was the case during the establishment of patrilineal surnames.

[12] Such was the case of Nazi Germany, where Jews were required to use names separate from those of Aryans (Ragussis 1986: 225). Similarly, American Army officials in the 1870s renamed the native Indian population by arbitrarily picking names from the pages of the New York City telephone book (Ragussis 1986: 225).

A widespread phenomenon within most modern cultures (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 2), the double construction of personal names encapsulates "I" and "We" identities - while the forename establishes our individual identities, the surname connects the "I" to its social and cultural matrix, thus explaining "who one is in the eyes of others" (Elias 1991: 184). Therefore, mundane as it might look, an investigation of naming practices provides an important insight into the process of identity formation within different societies. Moreover, while "[c]hange - or its prospect - challenges identities" (Jenkins 2008: 26), a study of a name change - and marital surname change in particular - can provide an entangled look into a discursive work behind women's engagement with "I" and "We" identities and, thus, offer knowledge about social and cultural conditions, discourses and practices.

Common within Western societies, hereditary or patronymic surnames are a modern invention - a Foucauldian scheme of knowledge, first and foremost, serving systems of power (Scott et al. 2002: 6). According to Scott et al., turning manpower into legible subjects - that is, to distinguish individual (male) subjects for the purpose of tax collection, land revenue, court and police work - played an important part in the process of modern state-making (see also Caplan 2001). Because of their lack of participation within the professional sphere and because the inheritance was typically passed through sons or other male heirs (Wilson 1998; Slovenko 1984), for a long time, women were not identified as individual civic subjects and, consequently, took husband's surnames upon marriage as "it was [husband's] name that best described and identified women to local officials" (Slavenko in Scott et al. 2002: 39)[13].

Historically, women with independent names had always been a rare phenomenon that also decreased over time[14] (Wilson: 1998). During the first stages of family name formation, women carried single names much longer than men and if they did bear a second name, it was because they were performing social roles usually assigned to men. However, in most cases, second names of women followed a pattern of patronymic organisation in relation to their fathers and husbands and, while it took a long time for this phenomenon to take shape,

[13] An illustrative example comes from American suffragist movement where married women who refused to change their surname after marriage would not be allowed to vote using their maiden family name (Omi 1997);
[14] Wilson mostly focuses on France, England and Italy during the period of early Middle ages (Wilson 1998)

the tradition of women obtaining the surname of their husband was universally accepted by the 19th century (McKinley 1990; Wilson 1998).

The gendered struggle over names has particularly strong associations with feminism (Thwaites 2017: 63). For example, the greatest example of this power struggle for social meanings can be found within the early suffragist movement. While by the end of the 19th century it had become customary to call a woman by her husband's full name (for example, Mrs John Smith), early suffragists appropriated the custom that until then had been used only by elite families. As both men and women with noble female ancestry would often maintain two surnames as a signifier of distinct social status, first wave feminists did the same to convey a political message that called for "individual sovereignty" of a woman (Omi 1997). According to the famous suffragist Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "[t]he custom of calling women Mrs. John This and Mrs. Tom That, and colored men Sambo and Zip Coon, is founded on the principle that white men are lords of all" (in Omi 1997: 114). Similarly, nineteenth century French feminists were calling for the "abandonment of patrilineality and challenged married women's subordinated legal status. Instead, they promoted matrilineality to establish, perpetuate, and value the female line, asserting matrilineality as the undergirding of a reconceptualized, more equitable legal and social status for women" (Eichner 2014: 660).

Second wave feminism produced an even more formulated attack against patrilineal practices. Gayle Rubin famously provided a Marxist feminist critique of the Western culture which is "based upon the exchange of women" (Rubin 1975: 170). She argued that the culture as we know it has been built on the exploitation of sexualized female - a Marxian commodity that is produced by a man-father, branded by his name and exchanged for its reproductive use value (Rubin 1975). It is through the systems of kinship that men's power is established and patronymic names are one of the symbolic manifestations of the social exploitation of women (Rubin 1975). Moreover, the primacy of male lineage in patronymic cultures imposes that the symbolic heritage of the mother has no value and is not "worthy of ongoing symbolic representation", consequently denying women the right for social and cultural steadiness (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660).

It is this "intimate link between ideology and language" (Mills and Mullany 2011) - so clearly expressed in patrilineal naming practices - that became of a central interest for scholars of the so-called linguistic turn. Through the 1970s, across the disciplines of social sciences, arts and humanities, particular attention was paid to language as an ideologically charged medium by which people construct identities and culture in general (Gibbon 2019; Mills and Mullany 2011; Barker and Galasinski 2007). As part of this intellectual development, feminists scholarship has produced a solid body of work investigating the relationship between language and gender, where the theorising of power is seen as "an essential part of the discipline" (Mills and Mullany 2011: 57).

Stories about naming as cultural narrative

While language is central to our understanding and construction of the culture (Barker and Galasiński 2007), our names are one of the primary linguistic tools that enable us to "make sense of who we are in particular social arrangements" (Pickering 2008:18). The field of cultural studies accommodates what both social science and humanities have been heavily invested into since the *linguistic turn* of the late 1970s - an investigation of meanings (Barker and Galasiński 2001: 1). With it's focal attention on the processes of "meaning making" as identity work, this thesis positions itself within the field of cultural studies.

Cultural studies focus on "the subjective dimension of social relations" and reveal how individuals make sense of who they are in particular social arrangements (Pickering 2008:18). Importantly, they reveal the "transformative potential" that may arise from "not only what is undergone (=action, event) but also how this is articulated (=meaning), understood, drawn on and shared with others" (Pickering 2008: 18). As experience needs to be coherent in order to be intelligible, we embrace discursive forms through which it can be realised (Pickering 2008: 26). Narrative, thus, is one of the major devices we use in order to interpret and establish the social world (Lawler 2008: 32). Importantly, the role of narratives is double fold: they serve as discursive tools as well as social and cultural assets that people outsource during this process (Lawler 2008: 34). Thus the analysis of cultural resources that individuals engage in producing these narratives make it possible to read those accounts as historically specific, intersectional stories about one's gender, national, ethnic or racial

identity. These resources - be them literary, cultural, social or scientific - in order to adhere to the rules of intelligibility, must be socially and historically readable (Lawler 2008: 38).

The fact that individual narratives are in effect a collection of "publicly-circulating narratives that are specific to time and spaces" (Lawler 2008: 38), makes it possible to treat them as discursive spaces where individuals engage in a *self-other* inquiry. However, contemporary narrative scholars have criticized extensively the generalized attitude that every individual account of life is a "teleological project" and feminist and postcolonial inputs in particular have shown how "desire for textual coherence [can] legitimize certain narratives while excluding or marginalizing others from the narrative canon" (Hyvärinen et al. 2010: 7). However, narrative scholars agree that "we urgently want and need our narratives to make sense" (Andrews in Freeman 2010: 183) and, albeit temporarily, we aim to deliver narratives that provide cathartic fulfillment; both for the interpreter and the *self*. So much so that "we instil in them a wholeness which is not theirs" (Andrews in Freeman 2010: 183).

As I argue in Part I of this thesis, more than any other, narratives of self-naming call for elevated coherency as they are linked to "crisis points" (Pilcher 2016) like marriage or divorce that challenge the "ontological security" (Giddens 1991) by interrupting our life narrative. More often than not, it is women who are expected to rewrite their social biographies in relation to their name change. Moreover, as self-naming practices are linked to what Jane Pilcher has termed "embodied named identity" (Pilcher 2016), the body stands as an inescapable "narrative horizon" (Weiss 2003) in women's production of stories of self-naming. Despite the ontological commitment "to keep [our] narrative going" (Giddens 1991: 54), the materiality and temporality of the body inevitably produces a self which "is not completely arbitrary or open-ended" (McNay 1999a: 323) and, thus, challenges Giddens' theory of the "reflexive project of the self" which suggests that people's life choices in late modernity are free from rigid structural and traditional constraints (Giddens in Thwaites 2017b: 64). Furthermore, the gendered nature of patrilineal naming practices - as a form of traditional "codes of practice" (Adams in Thwaites 2017b: 64) - limits women's options both at structural *and* discursive levels. Consequently, women's narratives of

self-naming could be perceived as sites of "inchoate tension" (Johnson and Johnson 2015) between structure, culture and agency (Glasgow and Bouchard 2018).

As it has been discussed, the patrilineal names system is inherently loaded with ontological questions of how individuals are positioned within this discursively contested space called social identity. Therefore, women's narratives regarding marital name change can be seen as exegetical in understanding how individuals make sense of/make intelligible their life choices and, ultimately, to provide bigger insights into major socio cultural shifts. Following Woodiwiss' et al. (2017) suggestion that looking at the hegemonic narrative frameworks helps us identify womens' agentic work within their discursive constructions, this thesis asks which and how cultural assets or stories are employed when constructing narratives of one's non-traditional surnames. And what happens when multiple vectors of power are present in one's story of self-naming.

Following the notion that diverse disciplinary definitions of stories and narratives impact the way they are being collected and analyzed (Denzin 2000: xi), in this thesis I actively read public and private accounts by Lithuanian women as narratives about self-naming. Even though many accounts (especially within the media) analyzed in this study consist of a few sentences only, I argue that the temporal dimension of the subject matter as well as the controversial socio-cultural atmosphere in which these narratives are situated calls for an (albeit temporal) elevated attention to discursive coherence and ideological integrity of these accounts. Moreover, speaking *out of* and *about* their already named bodies calls for more discursive discipline as they need to integrate the incorporated knowledge (Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006) into their discursive constructions.

Borrowing from Stephanie Taylor and Karen Littleton, this thesis treats narrative as a construction, in talk, of sequence or consequence, where "temporality is invoked" (Taylor 2006: 95). Therefore, I argue that, constrained by the biographical knowledge that is already "written in the name" and aware of "the flow of power in the wider world" (Pitre et al. 2013: 118), Lithuanian women deliver retrospective accounts about their social action of a surname change and establish situated subjectivities that discursively engage, challenge and negotiate familiar cultural structures, simultaneously creating performative agentic spaces

that are rich platforms to investigate wider social and cultural phenomenon. At the core of this process lies their engagement with intersecting discourses surrounding gender, national, ethnic, class and familial identities. Therefore, an important part of this work is to present a study into the genealogy of discourses surrounding the non-traditional surname in order to establish the knowledge of the ideological backdrop surrounding the suffix debate that serves as an inevitable pedagogy in light of which self-naming narratives - as a gendered *self-other* inquiry - are being constructed.

If the power is manifold and individuals are, thus, subjected to "cross-cutting identifications" (McNay 1999a: 329), then resistance, too, is open-ended and calls for innovative reconceptualizations of the self in order to "sustain and reconcile multiple and often conflicting meanings" (McNay 1999a: 329). With her intersectional analysis of naming practices of African American women in 19th century, Omi (1997) has demonstrated how different axes of power - in this case - race and gender - "as reflected through names and naming, tend to interact with one another in a way that changes their meaning and effect" (Omi 1997: 111). This thesis, then, analyses narratives about self-naming that are delivered both within the Lithuanian media and private semi-structured individual questionnaires and asks if and how hegemonic notions about gender, national and familial identities (strongly embedded in ethno-linguistic nationalist meta-narratives) are integrated, challenged and contested within individual accounts. What discursive resources are embraced in making women's non-traditional choices more intelligible and reestablishing their agency? In order to reach this goal, this thesis works against the backdrop of the scholarly work done by mostly Anglo-America scholars of contemporary postfeminism and uses this concept as "an analytic category for cultural critique" (Litosseliti et al. 2019) of historically situated narratives of contemporary Lithuanian women in relation to their non-traditional marital naming practices as an inquiry into how they are "structured, what institutions and knowledges they rely upon, and which kinds of subjects they therefore include or exclude" (Dosekun 2015: 965).

So, positioned within the fields of Gender and Cultural studies, this thesis presents an interdisciplinary qualitative study into the narratives of self-naming of contemporary Lithuanian women who have obtained a non-suffixed family name. Maintaining that

narratives have the capacity to capture the psychosocial (Andrews et al. 2004) dimension of identity work, while analysing both individual and public interviews of women who have obtained the new surname, this thesis aims to locate the existing complexities and tensions "between macro-level discourses and practices potentially promoting [...] ideas about language use [...] and micro-level realities" (Glasgow and Bouchard 2018: 1).

Literature review

The study of names and naming is generally perceived as belonging to the field of onomastics: "the field of study concerned with the origin and forms of proper names of persons or places" (*Merriam Webster Dictionary* in Wheeler 2018a: 2). In the recently published *Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming,* Carole Hough (2016) describes the field as traditionally concerned with historical inquiries into the etymology of various names with studies into *toponomastics* (place-names), *anthroponomastics* (names of human beings), *literary onomastics* (the study of names in literature) largely dominating the scholarly landscape of contemporary field of onomastics (Hough 2016). It has been also argued that a subdiscipline of *socio-onomastics* - or the study of name in society - "has gradually been gathering momentum over the last few decades (Hough 2016: 1). Studies into the *sociology of names* in particular have shown interest in "[t]he use of names in the construction of an individual's or community's identity [as a] central topic of investigation" (De Stefani in Wheeler 2018a: 2). However, despite the obvious epistemological similarities in their interest in the role of names as "paramount resources for the implementation of institutional power and ideology" (De Stefani 2016: 56)[15], sociologists invested into naming practices as cultural and political technologies of identity formation observe an extensive lack of cross-fertilisation between the two fields:

> It would appear therefore that there are tensions between the academic disciplines engaged in studying the phenomenon of names and naming, and [...] the emotional and, subjective aspects of names and naming appear to be largely absent. This may in part be being compounded by the perceived, yet false, dichotomy between the

[15] For example, De Stefani (2016) refers to a study investigating the use of racial discourse in establishing membership categories through the use of personal names within the political discussions initiated by the French nationalist party *Front National* and its leader Marine Le Pen (Clifton 2013)

disciplines, which, if removed, might [...] enrich the pool of resources and encourage a more dynamic and innovative approach (Wheeler 2018a: 3)

I would argue that it is precisely due to their epistemological investments in the power dimension within the processes of identity formation that the majority of existing research on women's naming practices have been affiliated with the fields of social sciences rather than that of traditional onomastics. The only extensive study into people's attitudes towards the non-suffixed female surnames in contemporary Lithuania serves as a great example of inattention to the ideological frameworks at work in patrilineal naming cultures. Conducted by a Lithuanian linguist, Rita Miliūnaitė (2013), it provides an extensive sociolinguistic investigation into historical and contemporary media discussions in relation to the development and introduction of the new surname. However, the corpus of her work consists of extensive thematic analysis of online reader comments published anonymously in relation to extensive public discussions that followed the petition of 2009, which called for an immediate revocation of the non-suffixed surname. With openly biased support for the authors of the Petition[16], besides valuable onomastic analysis of historical evolution of the phenomenon, she concludes that the reasons presented for an introduction of the non-suffixed female surname had little to do with the linguistic aspect of the suffix problem. Confirming Sara Wheeler's observation that emotional and subjective dimension of naming has been largely overlooked across the disciplinary spectrum (2018a: 3), Miliūnatė argues that the reasons for an introduction of the new surname - as they have been communicated, first, by the Lithuanian feminists and, later, by online testimonies of women who have chosen or were planning to choose the new family name due to potential social discrimination - are purely social and psychological and concludes that people's complexes are not a linguistic problem (Miliūnaitė 2013). Based on her data, she categorises those who have obtained the new surname as belonging to different psychological types: 1) those who feel that they are incomplete or lacking of something, 2) those who want to stand out from others, 3) social climbers, and 4) pure feminists[17]. The aim of my study, then, is to pick up where Miliūnaitė has left off. I am interested in the psychosocial dimension of women's

[16] The study is dedicated to her husband Aldonas Pupkis - one of the 13 authors of the Petition.
[17] Smolskienė, Lina. "Kalbininkė: už tradicines moterų pavardes mūru stojo vyrai." *Ryto allegro,* Feb. 8, 2015, www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/92346/kalbininke-uz-tradicines-moteru-pavardes-muru-stojo-vyrai [accessed July 12, 2019]

"complexes", the political content of their choices and how those choices can be understood in relation to larger cultural phenomena.

Even though it has been reported that a change of surname after marriage often brings an injury to their sense of selfhood (Robnett and Leaper 2013; Rom and Benjamin 2011; Boxer and Gritsenko 2005;) as well as imposes asymmetrical financial and professional loses (Goldin and Shim 2004; Kline et al. 1996), the prevalence of patrilineal naming choices is still a widely employed phenomenon among the majority of heterosexual women (MacEacheron 2016; Robnett et al. 2016; Hamilton et al. 2011; Gooding and Kreider 2010; Twenge 1997; Johnson and Scheuble 1995). Scholars of naming report that women belonging to certain social clusters - such as wealthier and more educated women - are less likely to follow tendencies in women's marital naming by retaining their birth names upon marriage (Goldin and Shim 2004; Hoffnung 2006; Kline et al. 1996; Johnson and Scheuble 1995, 2002). Reportedly, they also express more feminist sentiments and excersice more instrumentality and agency (Twenge 1997). However, even women who share feminist sentiments often "find themselves complicit in non-feminist and anti-feminist decision-making" (Thwaites 2017b: 62; Mills 2003). As studies into naming practices of self-labeled feminists outline, the traditionalism of their choices is often embedded in what Rachel Thwaites has called the choice feminism (Thwaites 2017b; see also Peters 2018; Stoiko and Strough 2017; for feminist mothers naming their children see Eshleman and Halley 2016). Men, on the other hand, reportedly almost never engage in this practice[18] (Snyder 2009).

Regardless of the fact that there are no more legal obligations for women to obtain their husband's surname upon marriage, studies into others' perceptions of women who have followed some form of unconventional marital naming demonstrate that they are perceived by many as more self and/or career oriented (Suter 2004) and less committed to their future family both as wives and mothers (Robnett et al. 2016; Scheuble, Johnson, and Johnson 2012; Robnett and Leaper 2013). Consequently, while comparing existing studies on women's premarital name produced with the societies of North America, Melanie MacEacheron concludes that "both sexes may tend to view women who retain premarital

[18] Here the reference is only to the heterosexual men in the U.S.

surname after marriage as less likely to focus on motherhood and more likely to be suited to a career, sexually unfaithful, and more likely to divorce." (2016: 156). Even some fairly recent studies report that women experience open or subtle pressure from their husbands in making marital naming decisions (Jones et al. 2017; Thwaites 2013). Equally important in women's naming practices is the role of the family of their future in-laws. Diana Boxer and Elena Gritsenko, for example, have documented how patrilocal expectations expressed by the husband's family cause a sense of what Pilcher has called contradictory embodiment (2016) for women who feel ethnically or morally foreign to the family of their in-laws (2005), and Michal Rom and Orly Benjamin report women's feelings of obligation in preserving the honor and familial history in contemporary Israelian families (2011). Moreover, MacEacheron goes as far as to argue that "the ultimate purpose of women's marital surname change was posited to be ensuring patrilineal descent reckoning, and enhancement of resource recruitment for children of the marriage by wives, from husbands and in-laws attendant on such reckoning" (2016: 159).

Arguing that heterosexual gender conventions produce a backdrop to *all* forms of naming choices, Victoria Clarke et al. (2008) initiate a welcome inquiry into actual or anticipated naming practices within same-sex partnerships in the contemporary UK (see also Underwood ans Robnett 2019; Jones et al. 2017; Petterson and Farr 2017; DiGreggio 2016; Almack 2005; Suter and Oswald 2003). Important contributions in relation to the power of names and surnames have been delivered by scholars investigating into the ethnic, racial and religious dimensions of naming and on various social repercussions that categorizations into *in-group* and *out-group* members have on individuals in various social networks (Wheeler 2018b; Zhao and Biernat 2018; Madziva 2016; Booth et al. 2012; Khosravi 2011; Wood et al. 2009; Gerhards and Hans 2009). Furthermore, epistemologies of naming practices have been extended and important theoretical contributions have been presented by anthropological research on naming that has highlighted the colonizing power of modern Western bureaucratic procedures on indigenous communities (Palsson 2014; Pina-Cabral 2010; Alia 2007; Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006). Additionally, exciting insights have been presented by Hayley Davies (2011) in her study on the perspectives of children on the role of naming practices in relation to contemporary family and kinship relations.

Interdisciplinary in nature, this study uses an existing body of scholarship produced by analysts of naming practices as a backdrop to its inquiry into marital naming practices of contemporary Lithuanian women. However, it also addresses the existing knowledge gaps currently present in this underexplored field of research (Hamilton et al. 2011; Clarke et al. 2008). Firstly, it aims to contribute by introducing a study that challenges an overarching preoccupation with naming practices of women belonging exclusively to the Anglo-American linguistic communities. While a renewed interest in marital naming practices can be observed in the field (Hamilton et al. 2011), only a few studies investigate women's choices of surnames outside the United States (for studies in the UK see Peters 2018; Jones et al. 2017; Thwaites 2017b; 2017a; 2013; Wilson 2009; Clarke et al. 2008; for Australia see Lindsay and Dempsey 2017). Consequently, most cited *theoretical contributions* on the role of names in social identity formation have been dominated by Anglo-American scholars (Finch 2008; Pilcher 2017; 2016; Mills 2003; Lieberson 2000; Giddens 1991). Therefore, sporadic publications on women's marital naming in Norway (Noack and Wiik 2008), Finland (Castrén 2018), Japan (Toyoda and Chapman 2017), Israel (Rom and Benjamin 2011) or China (Xiaoying 2017) exist as a welcome exception in the field dominated by the scholars mostly preoccupied with marital naming practices imbedded in Anglo-Saxon linguistic traditions. Moreover, as a study by Xiaoying Qi (2017) has successfully demonstrated, certain knowledge patterns established by Western academia are reversed when confronted with practices of naming embedded within different socio-political realities (as in the case of China) or linguistic traditions that comprise female surnames that have different morphological constructions - as in the case of Lithuania and other languages that assign feminizing suffixes to women's surnames (on Polish surnames see Walkowiak 2016; Nowakowska 2016; on Slovakian surnames see Valentová 2013; on Czech surnames see Hlubinková 2016).

With a few significant exceptions (Hamilton et al. 2011; Gooding and Kreider 2009; Noack and Wiik 2008; Johnson and Scheuble 1995), methodologically, the field of women's marital naming is dominated by small, quantitative (or mixed method) studies investigating tendencies and people's attitudes towards women's (sur)naming practices (Kerns 2011; Nugent 2010; Brooks 2013; Forber et al. 2002) as well as reasons provided in relation to the actual or the anticipated naming choices of, mostly, American women (Keels and Powers

2013; Hoffnung 2006; Gritsenko and Boxer 2005; Foss et al. 1989). However, recently, some important qualitative studies into the marital naming of contemporary women - including important contributions on same-sex couples (Jones et al. 2017; Clarker et al. 2008) - have been published, providing theoretically-informed explorations of (sur)naming practices of women in contemporary societies with patrilineal naming cultures (Jones et al. 2017; Lindsay and Dempsey 2017; Qi 2017; Thwaites 2017a; Rom and Benjamin 2011).

Often overlooked by other scholars of the sociology of naming, the monograph by Rom and Benjamin (2011) is of particular importance to the analysts of marital naming concerned with self-naming practices of women who do not belong to the Anglo-American linguistic community as it offers wider theoretical perspectives in understanding the contexts in which surname practices emerge, how they are negotiated, and what new forms of subjectivity emerge from the tensions between an individual and their community of practice. Based on empirical findings obtained by conducting extensive interviews with 42 Israeli Jewish women, the study looks both at the list of self-naming options exercised by the participants *and* at the list of ideologies or discourses these practices are embedded in. The study provides an extensive documentation of discourse on gender, feminism, familialism and religion that inevitably forms a network of interpretative frameworks through which women make sense of their marital naming decisions. It discusses historical situatedness of ethnic and aesthetic dimensions of naming practices, explores how notions of proper femininity and motherhood are employed in justifying traditional naming practices and acknowledges the temporal and spatial dimension of naming. Consequently, the study of Rom and Benjamin serves as an important study that has helped me in analyzing the data of the current study.

Rachael Robnett has recently outlined a list of potential directions in naming practices research (2017). Observing the prevailing tendency of heterosexual women to comply to the social norm to change their birth surname to that of their husband after marriage,[19] Robnett invites us to investigate how individuals "subvert or resist these traditions" (2017: 827). Drawing on existing interdisciplinary research, this thesis therefore aims to enrich

[19] As will be discussed, most research on naming is concerned with women's naming choices in the U.S. and the UK.

contemporary studies of patrilineal naming practices by expanding their geopolitical and epistemological territory. It offers a qualitative study into the practices of contemporary Lithuanian women who have adopted an unconventional family name after a new - feminist - linguistic tool of female naming was introduced in 2003. The originality of this research also lies in its extensive engagement with scholarly work presented by analysts of postfeminist culture, which so far has been an underexplored analytic category in gender and language research (Litosseliti et al. 2019).

Methodology

Data collection

The aim of data collection was to assemble stories of self-naming by distributing questionnaires to the Lithuanian women who possess (or have at some point possessed) a non-suffixed form of a family name be it only a non-suffixed surname added to the first name or a hyphenated version of a non-suffixed surname added to the birth surname. Consequently, answers from these women constitute the largest collection of narratives in this study. Additionally, surveys regarding self-naming have also been distributed to Lithuanian women who have opted for other forms of naming practices. These include:

- Women who have traditionally suffixed surname with en ending *-ienė*
- Women who have a hyphenated surname: their traditionally suffixed birth surname is hyphenated with the traditionally suffixed surname of her husband with an ending *-ienė*
- Women who decided to keep their birth surname after marriage
- Women who have chosen a non-suffixed form of their husband's "Slavic" surnames

All of the questionnaires were filled and delivered to me electronically. I, then, followed up with some of the participants by asking additional questions or requesting clarification of some statements. As personal names of women is the subject of the research, full anonymity was promised to all of the participants who filled individual questionnaires. Instead, all of the respondents have been coded with a combination of a letter and a number, where the

letter corresponds with the type of the surname they possess. The coding is described in Part IV of this study.

Secondary materials like media publications that concern the suffix question play an important role in this research as they provide access to what I understand as genealogy of discourses surrounding the question of Lithuanian female surnames. Therefore, my data also consists of public testimonies of women who have chosen traditional and non-traditional forms of marital surnames as presented within the Lithuanian media. The period of interest spans from 2003 to 2015 and it includes printed and online media outlets, both local and national[20]. Additionally, an important part of the corpus has been obtained by analyzing online comments of Lithuanian women in relation to an online publication titled "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" [Why do women take their husband's surname?].[21] While online media materials regarding the topic were obtained by using general research engines like *Google,* printed media from both local and national outlets was collected at *Martynas Mažvydas National Library of Lithuania* during one of the research trips.

The data from this group of participants was largely collected during my two research trips to Lithuania in February 2014 and June 2014. Data collection included: 1) finding, contacting and interviewing Lithuanian women who have non-traditional family names, 2) expert interviews (meetings with feminist activist who have initiated the suffix reform) and 3) work with media archives collecting texts that cover all aspects of the suffix reform and especially testimonies of women who have chosen the *new* surname.

In collecting data for this study, I used various non-probability sampling methods. I started with a purposive sampling method (LeCompte and Schensul 1999) by contacting the women I personally know who carry a non-suffixed family name. I then used a snowball sampling option by asking the same women to put me into contact with other potential participants. I also used my various social connections and asked people to introduce me to potential respondents. Likewise, I used a voluntary response method by reaching out to various online

[20] However, subsequent online publications on the topic have also been included in the analysis.
[21] Krogh, Severija. "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* Jan 11, 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

communities (like online groups of Lithuanian women living abroad) looking for potential participants for my study.

Upon receiving positive responses from women who agreed to participate in the study, I sent them a questionnaire asking to respond as broadly as possible to the questions outlined below. Women were asked to provide their 1) given name, 2) marital status, 3) current surname, 4) previous surname[s], 5) current age, and 6) education, and to answer in as much detail as possible the following questions:

1. Can you remember what was your first impression of the public debates surrounding the introduction of the non-suffixed female surname? Has your opinion changed since?
2. Why did you choose this version of the family surname? Can you please describe the process of the decision-making? Did you consider other options? Why did you discard other options?
3. How did you explain your choice to your spouse, his family, to the members of your own family?
4. What reactions did you receive from other people: your family members, friends, work colleagues? What kind of comment did you receive?
5. Could you say people's reactions have changed since then?
6. Could you say you share feminist sentiments?
7. What is your reaction to the comments that women who choose non-suffixed surnames are feminists?
8. Would you grant your daughter a non-suffixed surname at birth?

Upon receiving the answers, I would often follow up with a few questions to inquire into more details regarding their narratives. To sum up, all of the above mentioned methods and channels of data collection contributed to forming what I call the "General Sample" that consists of individual and public accounts of women's self-naming. The "General Sample" forms the core data for this study.

The second sample of the data is called the "Feminist Sample". It consists of voluntary responses from a group of women that belong to an online community concerned with expressing support for feminist ideas in Lithuania (titled *Feminizmas*). *Feminizmas* is a

Lithuanian-speaking group on the social media platform *Facebook* and currently has around 6000 members. Due to the fact that interviews with participants from this group were conducted at later stages of the research (in 2019) and given the very purposive nature of the sample, it is analysed separately within my study. The importance of this sample is that it enhances the comparative capacities of the study.

During the process of data collection, approximately 150 questionnaires have been sent out to women. While finding women with non-suffixed family names was not difficult, getting them to respond was much harder and a lot of time was consumed sending reminders and follow-up emails.

Narratives from the "General Sample" of participants form the largest number of testimonies collected through personal and online channels.

Total response from "General Sample" (excluding media accounts): 46 responses
Traditionally suffixed: 19 participants
Non-suffixed: 27 participants

Total response from "Feminist Sample": 23 responses
Non-suffixed (married): 11 participants
Divorced: 7 participants
Other: 5 participants

Methodological approach

When analysing interviews with women who have chosen unconventional surnames, this thesis takes inspiration from the narrative-discursive approach of identity work studies. Presented by Stephanie Taylor (Taylor (2006) and Taylor and Littleton (2006)), this approach is useful as it helps to evaluate the agentic work done by the speakers as they both engage and contest larger social meanings in their talk.

Informed by the discussions amongst schools of discursive psychology[22], discourse analysis and narrative psychology, a narrative-discursive approach maintains that "talk is constitutive [in that] meanings are not stable properties of objects in the world but are constructed, carried and modified in talk and interaction" (Taylor and Littleton 2006: 24). While Giddens theorizes self-identity as an ongoing reflexive biographical project, a narrative-discursive approach calls this process identity work, and, emphasizing the role of the social, aims to investigate how larger beliefs that are present in a speaker's socio-cultural environment "shape biographical work and their implications for how people construct accounts of [...] their previous experiences" (Taylor and Littleton 2006: 24). Importantly, even though this approach was constructed to analyze how speakers establish their biographical narrative in relation to previous tellings (which is not present within my data), I maintain that it is still productive in that the actual fact of having taken up a certain version of the surname as well as its daily presence in one's life calls for a much more thought-through - or as Taylor and Littleton put it rehearsed (2006) - biographical narrative. This does not impose that women tell the same story about self-naming every time they are asked about their motives[23]. However, due to the nature of the subject matter, this thesis maintains that there is a lot of identity work done before the actual act of speaking takes place. Conceptually, the work of Taylor and Littleton is useful to this thesis as it engages with the "sequential and consequential structuring of a personal biography" and shares my interest in "how personal narratives are in part shaped by collectively held narratives" (Taylor and Littleton 2006). Just like Taylor and Littleton, I am not interested in how true the accounts regarding surname change are, but rather look at "retrospective constructions, shaped in the talk for the particular purpose of the current interaction" (Taylor and Littleton 2006: 31).

One of the main analytical tools used by Taylor and Taylor and Littleton in a discursive narrative approach is that of an interpretative repertoire. Introduced by the discourse analysts in the field of social psychology, interpretative repertoire is one of the explanatory resources that speakers embrace while characterizing events and building arguments (Edwards 2011; see also Edley 2014). Within interview material, they are often responses to a particular

[22] Which, in turn, originates in ethnomethodology and Foucauldian theory; see Wetherell, Taylor and Yates (2014) for more discussions

[23] In fact, Taylor and Littleton maintain that a "complex aggregate of contexts" influence how even an often repeated story will differ in every telling (2006: 26).

theme or topic that has certain ideological significance (such as gender or race) and serve as an explanatory tool in linking a speaker's "descriptive practices to the broader ideological and historical formations in which those practices are situated" (Edwards 2011). Wetherell and Potter, who have theorized the method, claim that interpretative repertoire "is a set of terms used in explanation which depend crucially on certain metaphors and tropes" (1988: 172-173). Often contradictory (181), they are used selectively in respondents' talk (178) and serve as a productive tool in researching ideological consequences (181) of discourse. Importantly, while they are "always fitted to specific occasions and constructed out of the available interpretative resources" (182), they serve as productive tools in analysing discourse within its historical and social environment (Wetherell and Potter 1998).

Outline of the thesis

Following the body of work established by feminist scholars, this thesis maintains that patrilineal expectations rob women of independence and permanence of their social identity, devalue the symbolic heritage of the mother's family history and, consequently, operate as "a logic outgrowth of patriarchy and the acceptance of male priority and priviledge" (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660; see also Emens 2007; Mills 2003). The traditional Lithuanian naming system possesses a list of feminising suffixes that, by assigning women a specific role of a daughter or a wife in male centered familial constellations, inevitably exercises the power of producing a tight list of social meanings through which female identities are made intelligible. That is, it describes and dictates what gendered individuals will be visible/known/legible *as*. The feminist campaign lobbying for an elimination of the traditional suffix can definitely be seen as a political attempt to disturb the gendered imbalance of power inscribed in the traditional Lithuanian naming system. Following the suffix reform, a gradual appearance of new feminine visibilities that have embraced the non-suffixed surname in diversified and rather contradictory forms could be noticed both in private and public domains. Consequently, a repertoire of new femininities has been established instituting new social meanings and redefining how these women want to be known/legible/visible as. Thus, the overarching research question of this thesis is *how do women who have obtained the non-traditional surname make sense of their choices.* That is,

what new social meanings are produced in their biographical accounts of self-naming. And how, given the contradictory nature of the suffix reform, do they reestablish the intelligibility/agency of their gendered identity as they discursively navigate the networks of power inscribed both at macro (nationalist) and micro (familial) levels of patrilineal traditionalism. Echoing Simidele Dosekun, I am interested in "what institutions and knowledge they rely upon, and which kinds of subjects they therefore include and exclude" (2015: 965). Lastly, what are the ideological consequences of their discourse in relation to postsocialist gender formations?

The working hypothesis of this dissertation is that the knowledge/practice regime of neoliberal individualism (McAvoy 2015) serves as semantic glue in re-establishing the intelligibility and agency of these new gendered subjectivities. The controversial nature of these "troubled identities" (Taylor and Littleton 2006) are being performatively repaired by employing a list of discursive paradigms that I see as belonging to a contemporary culture of postfeminism. Following the work of cultural scholars of (transnational) postfeminism (Litosseliti 2019; Gill 2007; 2017; Dosekun 2015; McRobbie 2009) as a form of gendered neoliberalism (Gill 2017), I see discursive frameworks of *personal choice, aesthetic preference, heterosexual imaginary,* and *global dispositions* found in women's discursive accounts as constitutive of postfeminist subjectivities. Although postfeminism is generally understood as a cultural development of second wave feminism (Dosekun 2015), and postsocialist context is perceived as having historically bypassed "Western" feminism(s) (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015), I argue for the potential of postfeminist scholarship in analysing the narratives of self-naming produced by Lithuanian women and, thus, expand existing geographies of postfeminist scholarship to include the understudied contexts of postsocialist gender regimes. I use postfeminist sensibility as "an analytic category for cultural critique" (Litosseliti et al. 2019) and contend that performative cultural renegotiation of marital femininities lies at the heart of the discursive constructions provided by women with non-traditional Lithuanian surnames. I also hypothesize that neoliberal rationality affects the psychic life (Scharff 2015) or affective experience (McAvoy 2015) of gendered subjects and argue that a postfeminist celebration of youthful individualized heteronormative femininity affects perceptions of beauty and disgust that, in Lithuanian women's accounts, is, on the one hand, manifested through the repudiation of old, dull and

domesticated traditionally (sur)named femininities. On the other hand, women's choices of non-traditional family names reveal their aesthetic preference towards traditional Anglo Saxon practices of marital naming, in which both spouses share an identical (husband's) surname. While morphological peculiarities of the Lithuanian language usually do not enable this form of marital naming, opting for non-suffixed forms of the husband's surname is one of the ways to express global dispositions while mimicking "Western" forms of female marital naming. Jane Pilcher (2016) has recently argued for the importance of the corporal dimension of names in understanding social identities. Meanwhile scholars of gender underline the prevailing misogynist animosity towards older or bigger female bodies (Gill 2007: 9) in contemporary postfeminist culture. As I recognize that contemporary work on the sociology of names and postfeminist scholarship finds its epistemological affinity in their renewed interest in the body, I hypothesize that the aesthetic preference towards the new non-suffixed surname can be interpreted as a postcolonial desire to embody global youthful marital femininities, figuratively distancing themselves from dull and unappealing Soviet femininities. Just as a postfeminist sensibility commodifies a feminist agenda of women's empowerment in order to sell back heteronormative hegemony (McRobbie 2009), similarly, regardless of the progressive political nature of the suffix campaign, Lithuanian women's discourses about their choice of non-traditional surname fail to disturb the gendered assymmetry inscribed in patrilineal naming practices as it is largely built on a heteronormative desire of romantic coupledom and, to this day, does not embody a political alternative or extend a list of "inhabitable female subjectivities" (Ringrose and Walkerdine in Taylor 2012). Therefore, I speculate that the ideological ambivalence that comes across when analysing these narratives could be pointing to a neo-traditional nature of this new social phenomenon.

Perhaps due to the fact that most of the scholarship on the naming practices of women focuses on Anglo-American linguistic communities, a woman's choice to hyphenate or retain her birth surname is usually perceived as non-traditional for its deviation from patrilineal tradition (Clarke et al. 2008). However, Lithuanian female surnames accommodate a double burden of traditionalism as the structural inequality of patrilineal tradition that expects women to change their birth surname into that of their husband is enhanced by the presence of feminizing suffixes that embody premarital and post-marital female identities. The

non-traditionality of the suffix reform is based on the premise that women are no longer obliged to be positioned as either a daughter or a wife by offering the possibility to omit the traditional suffix from their family name. However, as the majority of the participants indicated that they did not obtain the new surname in order to "hide" their marital status and rather focussed on the cultural resignification of marital female identities, the structural inequality of Lithuanian patrilineal tradition remains intact. This is further illustrated by the unpopularity of the new surnames in (sur)naming their own daughters.

While analysing the reasons behind the popular practice of retaining the woman's birth surname upon marriage in contemporary China, sociologist Xiaoying Qi warns against the colonizing effects of interpreting this practice through the modernist lens of individualisation and demonstrates how, in historically distinct contexts, practices that mimic women's emancipation can, instead, be seen as neo-traditional practice of naming which is based on "patriarchal inheritance and obligation" (2017: 1001). On the other hand, some recent contributions to transcultural postfeminist knowledge production have observed that the "glamorous neo-traditionalism" of celebrity culture - especially in relation to popular representations of motherhood - are constitutive of contemporary neoliberal feminism (Martínez-Jiménez and Gálvez-Muñoz 2019). Additionally, scholars of postsocialist parenting practices observe how rising popularity in "natural" motherhood has been incorporated into neo-traditional state supported ideologies (for Russia, see Avdeeva 2020). Consequently, as I do not suggest that all non-traditional social practices should be understood as embedded in neo-traditional ideology, I speculate that the new surname so far has been employed by Lithuanian women as a linguistic tool for neo-traditional renegotiation of marital femininity, while the structural asymmetry of patrilineal tradition has remained intact.

The primary goal of this thesis is to offer an extensive critical analysis of self-naming narratives by contemporary Lithuanian women. However, understanding the embeddedness of women's naming practices in their cultural, political and familial contexts, I, first, seek to establish *theoretical, historical and analytical frameworks* of this study.

In Part I of this thesis, I argue that when Lithuanian women talk about their choice of non-traditional family name, they produce performative narratives of embodiment. I introduce the concept of narrative inquiry as the main theoretical paradigm of this study and argue for its usefulness in positioning the *self* within a distinct psychosocial zone (Andrews et al. 2004) and, thus, interrogating both micro and macro levels of subjectivity production. Following a critical discursive approach, this work understands agency and subjectivity of individual accounts as constructed through historically situated sets of meanings and discourses. And while personal stories can be multiple in that they can be assembled, disassembled and performed differently for different audiences (Riessman 2008), they always rely on their cultural locus in order to be intelligible (Deniz 2000). Contingency of the personal story is, thus, an important feature in establishing intelligible subjectivities. This question becomes even more pressing in situations which Seale (2004) has described as moments of crisis of self-identity that disturb and fracture the social order (42). Non-traditional practices of naming, I argue, ask for elevated attention to the coherence of the personal story in order to re-establish an intelligibility of one's self and, consequently, to recover a legitimate place in common memberships (Seale 2004) as well as to reconcile new social persona (du Gay in Watson 2008) with our own narrative identity (Ricoeur 1991). However, gender identities (as well as national, ethnic, racial or class identities) are bound to situated power structures which "construct all knowledge or stories" (Woodiwiss et al. 2017) and, consequently, makes some stories more tell-able than others (Andrews 2010). Therefore, it is in the ability of an individual to reconcile multiple and sometimes conflicting meanings that the possibility of a creative dimension of agency is established (McNay 1999a: 329).

In the second part of this chapter, I inquire into the relationship between the naming practices and the body. Following recent criticism of scholars of naming, I aim to reposition the body back into the understanding of practices of social identification and argue that names label bodies and embody knowledge. I use the work of sociologist Jane Pilcher who has introduced a concept of embodied named identity to argue for the importance of bodies as an integral part of the social practices of naming, with sexed and gendered bodies being one of the most obvious examples (Pilcher 2016; Pilcher 2017). I then proceed to theorize personal names - and women's family names in particular - as arbitrary commodities that,

just like other consumer goods, have a capacity to both personalize and socialize the carrier of the name (Lieberson 2000; Layne 2006). I conclude that social identities and personal biographies - as they are constructed within narratives of self-naming - should be approached as inseparable from the materiality of people's bodies.

Part II of this study is concerned with the genealogy of discourses related to the role of traditional Lithuanian female surnames. It aims to document the network and interlace of historical and contemporary discourses in order to map the context in which women make their naming choices (Smith in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 44). In this chapter, I argue that nationalism is the founding paradigm of modern Lithuanian identity (Donskis 2002), and that the Lithuanian language has played a key role in establishing, perpetuating, and sustaining the integrity of what contemporary scholars call the mythologized ethnolinguistic identity (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018). Lithuanian language ideology sees Lithuanian women as chief guardians and repository of national spirit and ethnic tradition. Moreover, the Lithuanian surnames and especially the "ancient" suffixes of female surnames are constructed as untouchable cultural stuff within the hegemonic language ideology. So when, in 2003, the State Commission of the Lithuanian Language (SCLL) legitimized the non-suffixed female surnames to be used alongside the traditional suffixed ones, it was faced with a hostile backlash, and discussions about whether the traditional system of surnames should be abandoned continue until today. As I propose a historicized, gendered understanding of both nationalist and language ideologies of contemporary Lithuania, I argue that the self-naming practices of Lithuanian women are inevitably embedded in both bureaucratically and discursively institutionalized language ideology. Consequently, an in-depth understanding of the genealogies of available collective resources in narratives of self-naming by contemporary Lithuanian women enables one to recognize moments of bottom-up strategies that may contest or subvert dominant ideologies (Cameron 2003). The potential of the creative dimension of these narratives is of extreme interest in this thesis. Moreover, the emerging dissatisfaction with existing suffixes in traditional female surnames in other post-socialist societies (i.e. the Czech Republic and Slovakia[24]) suggests that traditional female surnames can be theorized as an analytical category where language and gender identities are reproduced, challenged and reversed when confronted with other -

[24] See Nowakowska (2016) for more on Slavic feminizing suffixes.

often competing - ideologies. In this chapter, I also analyse narratives of marital naming by Lithuanian women who chose a specific form of non-traditional self-naming. More precisely, I present narratives of women who made a controversial decision to not add the traditional Lithuanian suffix of a married woman next to the *Slavic* surnames of their husbands and conclude that non-traditional naming choices of these women position traditionally (sur)named female marital surnames at the centre of discursive and semantic tension. A tendency that, as it is discussed in Part IV of this study, becomes even more openly expressed within narratives of women who have opted for the "feminist" non-suffixed surname.

Part III of the study focuses on the notion of postfeminism and its theoretical potential in the field of language and gender research, especially when it comes to the under-theorized field of postsocialist gender formations. There have been only a few attempts to apply the notion of postfeminist sensibility (Gill 2007) in relation to the postsocialist world (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015) and my aim in this chapter is to set the ground for the usefulness of this interdisciplinary concept in relation to the empirical research into contemporary postsocialist femininities. Starting with the discussion of the cunning (Fraser 2009) interlace between liberal feminism and contemporary neoliberal hegemonies, I aim to articulate what contemporary media and cultural scholars describe as the colonizing effects of neoliberal rationality in depoliticizing feminist calls for social justice. While postfeminism is often understood as a spatiotemporality mostly linked to the Western second-wave feminism (Dosekun 2015), I argue for the suitability of the concept in relation to the contexts that have historically bypassed feminism (Chen in Dosekun 2015).

A big part of this chapter is dedicated to the growing research into what Rosalind Gill has called postfeminist sensibility (Gill 2007). Cultural scholar Rosalind Gill has described double entanglement (McRobbie 2009) by analysing postfeminist culture as a patterned - yet contradictory - phenomenon that affects and shapes contemporary gender regimes by "circulating set[s] of ideas, images and meanings" (Banet-Weiser et al. 2019: 3). The resexualization of women's bodies (Gill 2007) occurs through freely chosen aesthetic labour (Elias et al. 2017), and an endorsement of sex positive (Butler 2013), youthful and girlish femininities (Lazar 2017) which, in turn, intensifies "fear and anxiety about ageing" (Elias et

al. 2017: 29). The promotion of thin, entrepreneurial and autonomous subjectivities is embodied by white middle-class motherhood (Cairns and Johnston 2015; also McRobbie 2013). The subsequent stigmatization of working-class women as an abject (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008) femininity, renounced for its inability to adapt, change and reinvent (McRobbie 2013). Finally, the penetration of postfeminist sensibility into the affective and psychic domains (Gill 2017), as analysts of postfeminist culture (Gill 2017) point out, demonstrates how "neoliberalism is lived out on a subjective level" (Scharff 2015). All of these patterns are described by a growing number of gender scholars as constitutive of contemporary postfeminist gender regimes.

Building on the work of contemporary scholars of postsocialist neoliberalism who caution against an understanding of neoliberalism (or, in this case, gendered neoliberalism (Gill 2016)) as "a unidirectional flow of [...] hegemonic ideologies from the West into postsocialist settings" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 211), I use the existing knowledge of the patterned nature of the postfeminist sensibility to identify mutually responsive discourses and practices (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218) in order to recognize how a postfeminist cultural agenda is domesticated (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016) within postsocialist Lithuanian public and political discourse in relation to contemporary politics of gender.

In Part IV of this thesis I engage in an extensive analysis of the data of this study. I start with identifying the most common discursive repertoires of women who could be described as having chosen traditional marital surnames with a suffixed ending *-ienė*. I argue that besides a number of reasons for traditional naming also observed by other scholars of traditional naming (Clarke et al. 2008), Lithuanian women heavily rely on the ethno-linguistic nationalist discourse, thus endorsing a notion that the construction of appropriate femininity in contemporary Lithuania is strongly intertwined with the narrative of language preservation.

With the exception of the study presented by Goldin and Shim (2004), most researchers into naming practices associate *both* the keepers of birth surname upon marriage and the users of hyphenated family names with nontraditional naming (Hoffnung 2006). However, comparing discursive constructions of Lithuanian women who obtained these two forms of

post-marital naming, I argue that they produce very divergent discursive constructions as narratives of respondents carrying hyphenated family names are still embedded in the notion of family names as a way of doing/being family (Clarke et al. 2008) whereas testimonies of surname keepers present strong - often feminist - criticism concerned both with the patrilineal expectations of traditional naming and the gendered assymetry inscribed in the semantic meanings of traditional Lithuanian suffixes. As this chapter demonstrates, contrary to my initial assumptions, participants who kept their *maiden* surname upon marriage presented much more political narratives than those who have opted for the new non-suffixed family names, widely perceived as feminist within the Lithuanian society.

Instead, narratives of women who posses a family name constructed using this new linguistic tool largely operate on a number of discursive paradigms: that of personal choice, aesthetic preference, heterosexual imaginary and global femininities. Supporting the research presented by international scholars of women's naming practices that choice feminism is used extensively by women who struggle to depoliticize the traditionalism of their naming practices (Thwaites 2017b; Peters 2018; Stoiko and Strough 2017), respondents from the "General Sample" (as well as those from the "Feminist Sample") rely extensively on the notion of individual choice as a way to re-establish the intelligibility of their culturally contested choice of family name. This undermines the often documented reason of injuries and pressure from their husbands and their families in influencing women's name choices.

The aesthetic paradigm contains the most common interpretative repertoires that respondents engage with when discussing the aesthetic qualities of the new surname. While women extensively refer to the phonetic and semantic qualities of the new name as defining reasons in the process of decision making, they also produce a list of other or abject femininities that the traditional suffix -ienė is seen as representing. More often than not, the more beautifully sounding non-suffixed *-ė* surname is juxtaposed with old, dull, domesticated femininities often represented within those narratives as embodied by the figure of the mother-in-law. Using the existing body of research produced by analysts of postfeminist culture (Litosseliti et al. 2019), I argue that postfeminist sensibility (Gill 2007; 2017) serves as a framework of intelligibility through which Lithuanian women make sense of their unconventional naming

choices, consequently making it possible to argue that the new surname in contemporary Lithuania is seen as a linguistic tool in producing neo-traditional marital femininities that refer to both micro and macro levels of the psychosocial dimension of subjectivity negotiation.

The macro level of these narratives, I argue, is enhanced through a discursive engagement with what I describe as the paradigm of global dispositions, as very often Lithuanian women who opted for the non-suffixed family name describe this choice as a second best option in their desire to construct a family name that would serve as a shared title for both spouses. Constructed on the Anglo-Saxon naming tradition where a man and a woman - due to the lack of gendered endings - usually share identical surnames, many participants describe this form of marital naming as the most desirable way of marital naming. Some have presented intensively affective narratives where the animosity towards traditional naming practices is coupled with rage and a strong sense of injustice regarding the fact that, contrary to those marrying non-Lithuanian citizens, they are not able to follow this modern tradition of marital naming. As some of the respondents who are currently residing outside Lithuania report having used the new surname as the one that best facilitates their transnational positioning, I bring forward the importance of further investigation into the naming practices of Lithuanian women who are currently living abroad. However, besides its potential to construct more intelligible social identities for women who live transcultural lives, the discursive paradigm of global identities also sheds light on the way the new surname can be understood as communicating a postcolonial desire to construct marital femininities that are detached from the semantically and culturally overburdened image of Soviet femininity and, instead, are figuratively positioned in the stable and happy future associated with "Western" forms of heteronormative femininity.

PART I: Narratives of self-naming - performative stories of embodiment

No plot ever originates with us[25]

Introduction

Clive Seale argues that, in a very broad sense, social and cultural life is a fundamental part of human experience through which we make sense of our lives (Seale 1998). However, his study of bereavement narratives reveals a sharp presence of nature/culture divide when dying people finally "fall out of the culture that had formed their life's sheltering canopy" (Seale 2004: 37). Seale refers to the crisis of death or bereavement as fateful moments that challenge our ontological security and argues that confrontations with illness and loss "remind us that the material life of the body precedes its narrative constructions" (Seale 1998; Seale 2004).

While not present in every case of illness or death, a well trained image of a person who has forgotten her own name also serves as a harsh example of an individual who has lost her "ontological security" (Giddens 1991). Naming practices are identity practices through which we are located (or locate ourselves in the case of a name change) within our (imaginative) communities. Assigned to us at birth, personal names are social tools through which we internalize, confront, negotiate and claim our individual and social identity. An individual who cannot recall her own name, thus, stands as a stark figure of a person whose social bonds have been broken; a symbol of a body who has "fallen out of culture" (2004).

The experience of facing death or terminal illness, importantly, demonstrates "that all of our cultural life is predicated upon our material existence in bodies" (Seale 2004: 36), but there are other moments of "great personal and general social change" that disturb our social bonds (Seale 2004: 42). A change of a name - too - can be described as a moment of crisis of

[25] Lawler 2008: 34.

self-identity that calls for "narrative reconstruction" (Seale 2004: 42) that individuals perform in order to re-claim a legitimate place in imagined communities (Seale 1998; Seale 2004). Such "discursive narratives of the self characteristically contain justifications, excuses and rationalizations [and aim to] depict social bonds when they are in fact broken" (Riesman in Seale 2004: 42).

Following Seale's broad definition of narrative, this thesis frames marital surname changes[26] as performative accounts that tell stories about ourselves and our preferred place in imaginative communities. Moreover, as this thesis is concerned with practices of (mostly, marital) surname changes of women that challenge the traditional order of female naming practices, one can see their narratives as "ressurective practices" that rely on discursive knowledge in order to recover a legitimate place in common memberships. Consequently, discursive resources that are employed within these narratives of self-naming speak volumes about cultural and social processes that inform, shape and challenge situated subjective experiences. Furthermore, given that the new surname is a recent social phenomenon that has strong ideological links to the feminist agenda, this thesis aims to identify moments of agency and transgression in relation to the existing gender identities in postsocialist Lithuania, as manifested within narratives of self-naming by women who have chosen to obtain the 'modern' surname.

In this chapter, I aim to establish a theoretical framework of my thesis. I argue that when Lithuanian women talk about their choice of non-traditional family name after the marriage, they produce performative narratives of embodiment. In what follows, I give an overview of what is perceived as a narrative inquiry and argue that its interdisciplinary nature and its positioning of the *self* in a distinct psychosocial zone (Andrews et al. 2004), provides a fruitful theoretical framework within which to understand accounts of self-naming as autobiographical stories of the self as embedded in their socio-historical context; that is, "drafted into being through available, prevailing, ideologies" (McAvoy 2015: 26). Consequently, narratives of self-naming also provide insights into historical meta-narratives and serve as platforms to analyse wider socio-cultural phenomena. I then engage with notions of narrative coherence and narrative performativity, where I draw on the work of such

[26] Here I refer only to marital name changes of heterosexual women in the Western context

scholars as Sidonie Smith (1995) and Lois McNay (1999a; 1999b). In the second part of this chapter I engage with scholars of naming in their criticisms of the absence of attention to what Jane Pilcher (2016; 2017) calls named-body identities and theorize narratives of naming of performative speech acts of gendered embodiment.

Narrative inquiry and self-naming

Narrative inquiry

While for a long time narrative was a domain of literary studies (Riessman 2008: 4), there is also nothing new in using narratives as research material in social science (Hyvärinen 2008: 449). Ultimately, "both literature and sociology are dealing with texts" (Kohli in Hyvärinen 2008: 449). Therefore, what was brought over by the so-called narrative turn shared (but not simultaneously) an interest in narrative as concept: first in literary studies, then in historiography and social science[27], narrative "has emerged as an autonomous object of inquiry" (Ryan in Hyvärinen: 2008: 450).

Today, in a wide range of disciplines, narratives are seen as contributing to the culturalist or constructionist perspective[28] in that they help to locate the *self* in a distinct psychosocial zone (Andrews et al. 2004). A discourse-based approach, narrative inquiry theorizes self and identity as a contextually-shaped phenomenon that is "constituted in talk" (Bamberg et al. 2007: 1). Consequently, following a critical discursive approach (see Wetherell 1998; Billig 1991; Billig et al. 1988), subjectivities produced through narratives should be seen as psychosocial subjectivities that call for a "macro, critically broad lens [and attentiveness] to broader context of talk, the historical situation, and the ideologies reproduced in talk" (McAvoy 2015: 23). While definitions of narrative (as well as methodologies of narrative analysis) vary from study to study, they follow a phenomenology that sees meaning-making through narratives as both individual and social phenomena (Andrews et al. 2004). Consequently, a narrative approach sheds light on 1) the agency and subjectivity of individual

[27] In education, psychology and sociology in the early 1980s (Hyvärinen: 2008: 450).
[28] Speer and Potter (2002) describe a constructionist approach as that which applies "a combination of insights from the sociology of scientific knowledge, poststructuralism, ethnomethodology, and CA to psychological issues and concepts" (156).

accounts as well as on 2) the constructive nature of the discursive resources through which narratives are shaped, thus, offering "new spaces for investigating relations between subjects and structures" (Andrews et al. 2004: 9). By discursive resource, I mean "a set of meanings that exist prior to an instance of talk" (Reynolds et al. 2007: 335).

Importantly for this thesis, Catherine Riessman hypothesizes that growing enthusiasm over narrative is connected to a postmodern preoccupation with identity: "[n]o longer viewed as given and 'natural', individuals must now construct who they are and how they want to be known, just as groups, organizations, and governments do. In postmodern times, identities can be assembled and disassembled, accepted and contested, and indeed performed for audiences" (2008: 7). Consequently, contemporary constructionist narrative scholars read stories that people tell about their lives as stories about multiple selves that are situated in distinct socio cultural frameworks, often "working strategically to resist those contexts" (Squire in Hyvärinen 2008: 451). Maintaining that personal stories are only intelligible when they have a "cultural locus" (Denzin in Andrews et al. 2000: 5), post-structuralist narrative scholars investigate which patterns of representation emerge within their field of study and how they contribute to different realities (Andrews et al. 2004: 6). This top-down approach to narrative interrogates both how individual narratives are rooted within their sociocultural context and, importantly, "how apparently 'personal' stories impact back on the culture" (Plummer in Andrews et al. 2004: 6).

With regard to this thesis, interdisciplinarity is one of the most important aspects of the narrative concept (Hyvärinen 2008: 457). Since the 1960s, due to the rapid influx of different voices and genres into the otherwise elitist and traditionally humanist field, humanities and cultural studies have been striving for a more "conceptual order [within] the expanding cultural field" (Andrews et al. 2004: 2). On the other hand, the growing number of qualitative studies in such disciplines as sociology and psychology highlight how subjective experience is inevitably shaped by cultural circumstances (Andrews et al. 2004: 2). Therefore, studies of narrative provide an interdisciplinary terrain that accommodates investigations of cultural and social processes through an inquiry into situated subjectivities (Andrews et al. 2004).

The interdisciplinary nature of the narrative approach has also contributed to the expansion of what is perceived of as narrative. Regardless of a growing interest into narrative within a broad spectrum of fields (Riessman 2008), narrative scholars warn it would be unhelpful to expect "that narratives are formally similar, always complete, and always neatly distinct from other kinds of discourse" (Ochs and Capps in Hyvärinen 2008: 448). Instead, "what we take narrative and story to be determines how it will be collected and studied" (Denzin in Andrews et al. 2004: xi). Due to its complex epistemology,[29] definitions of narrative within the field of social sciences vary from a sociolinguistic understanding of narrative as thematic text produced within a question - answer framework, to anthropological investigations into the entire life story (Riessman 2008: 5). Researchers of psychology and sociology, on the other hand, work with "extended accounts of lives in context" produced over the course of interactions (Riessman 2008: 5). However, while working definitions of narrative vary dramatically, a fundamental feature of narrative is contingency: "[w]hatever the content, stories demand the consequential linking of events or ideas" (Salmon in Riessman 2008: 5). Consequently, narrative coherence is seen as an ordering feature of narrative that separates it from other types of discourse[30] and, thus, provides "possibilities to study the recounting of lived experience along the dimensions of lived time, and how, by way of reflecting on the past, a (more or less) coherent sense of self is created" (Bamberg et al. 2007: 5).

Coherence and identity

A number of scholars have problematized "the coherence paradigm" (Hyvärinen et al. 2010). Feminist and postcolonial scholars in particular have criticized "the coherent self" as a cultural construction and demonstrated how a desire for textual coherence overlooks "an effect of gendered and racialized discourses and practices" (Hyvärinen et al. 2010: 7). However, as Mark Freeman observes, narratives are not solely defined by unity, chronology or linearity, but rather by a synthesis of heterogeneous[31] elements that matter (in Hyvärinen et al. 2010: 185). He argues that even studies that question the concept of narrative coherence

[29] Riessman outlines the development of narrative theory that starts with an Aristotelian understanding of narrative with its *beginning, middle and the end* and is later shifted by "French structuralism, Russian formalism, poststructuralism, cultural analysis, and postmodernism" (Riessman 2008: 5).
[30] Bamberg et al. (2007) discusses those extensively more extensively.
[31] "Synthesis of heterogeneous elements" is a concept of Ricoeur (Freeman in Hyvärinen et al. 2010: 185).

seem to demonstrate that "behind the manifested in-coherence or 'a-coherence' of narratives [...] a latent coherence lurks" (Freeman 2010: 167). Similarly, he comments on the contested concept of identity using the Ricoeurian notion of narrative identity as "neither an incoherent series of events nor an immutable substantiality" (Ricoeur in Freeman 2010: 185), manifestations of which are "never quite the same and, with rare exceptions, never entirely different" (Freeman 2010: 185).

Consequently, this thesis is built around the Ricoeurian belief that "narratives are essential means of human sense-making" (Squire 2013: 50) both as individual constructions and cultural resources that we employ in constructing our narrative identities. It also maintains that a certain degree of coherence and integrity is essential to an individual's self-identity (Freeman 2010; Watson 2009). At a more fundamental level, the Ricoeurian understanding of narrative captures the temporality of human experience as a third medium that integrates the dissonant paradigms of history and fiction and, consequently, "forms an irreducible dimension of both individual and social identity" (McNay 1999a: 319). Importantly, it captures the temporalized perception of the self as the self that has unity that is bound to change through time (McNay 1999a: 316). For Ricoeur, narratives are meaning-making (performative) events that, while open for re-configuration, construct notions of identity that are "constrained and over-determined by culturally sanctioned meta-narratives that form the parameters of self-understanding" (McNay 1999a: 323) *and*, as I will argue later, by socio-symbolic norms and practices, by which "the body comes to bear cultural meanings" (Butler 1998: 520). The latter is particularly relevant in relation to the narrative dimension of gender identity, as "temporalising the concept of gender also suggests the active and constraining presence of the past within the present in so far as the living-through of gender norms constantly reinscribes them upon the body" (McNay 1999a: 318).

To sum up, as a temporal dimension of the self, the Ricoeurian notion of narrative identity, while built along the lines of a post-structuralist emphasis on the constructed nature of identity, emphasizes that "[t]he self may always be in a state of re-configuration in order to incorporate the flux of experience; however, it is not completely arbitrary or open-ended" (McNay 1999a: 323). This statement challenges notions of contingency and multiplicity in

identity narratives, as expressed by some social constructionist scholars[32]. Consequently, following McNay's reading of Ricoeur, personal narratives are meaning making events that are constitutive of "restrictive conditions" and "exclusions", but are, however, indissoluble from the persistent rearticulation of the self that has unity - "the dynamic unity of narrative which attempts to integrate permanence in time with its contrary, namely diversity, variability, discontinuity and instability" (McNay 1999a: 322). Identity narratives, thus, with all their potential divergent trajectories, call for more reflexive work then any other type of discourse (McNay 1999a).

The inescapability of gendered practices in the construction of identity (McNay 1999a: 323) is probably best manifested within patrilineal family name systems. Marital surname change is, first and foremost, a gendered phenomenon (Pilcher 2016; Alford 1987) and while not every language with a patrilineal family name system reveals the gender of a surname's carrier, traditional Lithuanian surnames of women impose a double-edged gendered asymmetry as they connote women's gender *and* marital status, as well as provide more subtle information regarding one's ethnic or familial background. As speech acts (Austin 1962) that inflict primary violence (Butler in Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006: 17), they serve as socio-symbolic norms and practices, by which "the body comes to bear cultural meanings" (Butler 1998: 122).

As our name is one of the essential - and one of the most visible (Maclean in Eichner 2014) - blocks of our social identity (Jenkins 2008; Giddens 1991), a change of a surname undoubtedly challenges our personal narratives as we need to integrate a new social persona (du Gay in Watson 2008: 431) into our individual biography. Consequently, womens' accounts about marital surname change are autobiographical stories where narrative coherence works as an "ordering principle" (Bamberg et al. 2007: 5) of what some scholars understand as our identity work: a "mutually constitutive process in which people strive to shape a relatively coherent and distinctive notion of personal self-identity and struggle to come to terms with and, within limits, to influence the various social identities which pertain to them in the various milieux in which they live their lives" (Watson 2008: 431).

[32] Like Riessman in my work so far.

Therefore, this thesis maintains that when women talk about their surname change, they "do narratives" (Elliot in Reynold et al. 2007: 336) of self-naming in that they deliver retrospective accounts about surname changes that rely extensively on narrative coherence as a "structural glue" (Bamberg et al. 2007: 5), providing some level of integrity to their identity work. The thesis is interested in how such women "actively manoeuvre" among cultural, discursive and institutional notions of who they can and want to be (Watson 2009) and which discursive resources they embrace in order to "keep their narrative going" (Giddens in Watson 2009) - a process during which, as Sidonie Smith would argue, "the autobiographical speaker becomes *a performative subject*" (my italics) (Smith 1995: 17).

Narrative as performance

In line with post-Foucauldian theorists of discursive identity construction (McNay 1999a: 175), Smith argues that "there is no essential, coherent autobiographical *self* before the moment of self-narrating" (my italics) (Smith 1995: 17). In fact, according to Smith, the very notion of a "wholesome" self-identity is a modern phenomenon closely linked to "hegemonic 'strategies' for the cultural reproduction of normative selves" (Michel de Certeau in Smith 1995: 18). Instead, she reframes Judith Butler's concept of gender performativity to argue that the "self that is said to be prior to the autobiographical expression or reflection is an *effect* of autobiographical storytelling [and so it is] narrative performativity [that] constitutes interiority" (Smith 1995: 18). Influenced by Butler's early writing on gender identity as performatively constituted through continuous acts of reiteration of historical discourses and practices in relation to differently sexed bodies, Smith understands autobiographical storytelling as "a performative occasion [through which] the power of discourse produce[s] effects through reiteration" (Butler in Smith 1995: 19).

I would argue that, while Smith mostly refers to the performative nature of autobiographical writing, her Butlerian reading provides a fruitful framework in analysing narratives of self-naming as "performative occasions", through which gender (as well as national, ethnic, racial or class) identities are constructed. However, while Smith argues that the "contextually-marked" nature of autobiographical texts enables the production of multiple and "sometimes divergent narratives of identity" (Smith 1995: 18), I maintain that it is

important to evaluate "powerful constraints or limits to the ways in which identity may be changed" (McNay 1999a: 318). Most importantly, and differently from post-structuralist understandings of constraint as an "external force", those limits can also be self imposed (McNay 1999a: 318).

Following the Ricoeurian understanding of narrative identity as linked to the temporalized perception of the gendered self, narratives of self-naming are performative in that they use available socio-symbolic norms and resources in order to construct situated accounts of gender (national, ethnic, class) identity. However, they are also discursive events that do identity work in that they struggle to maintain coherent notions of selfhood (McNay 1999a: 315) by recognizing the active presence of the past and "the uncertainties of the immediate future" (McNay 1999a: 317). By the "active presence of the past", I refer to their already named bodies, how "they are positioned by who they already are" (Taylor in Taylor and Littleton 2006: 25).

In relation to the Lithuanian surname system and the subsequent introduction of the new surname, certain combinations of female surnames already contain a spatially and temporally distributed biography that is embedded within one's name. For example, a common combination of two surnames (especially because it contains information about a woman's marital status) lays out the story of a woman who is a daughter of a man *x* and is now married to a man *y*. Moreover, the surnames of a growing number of women who choose to use some form of the non-suffixed marital surname position them within a certain time frame (as having married after 2003) and connote social identities of a "general cohort" (Layne 2006) that have their own historicity (Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006: 20). Autobiographical stories of self-naming are therefore inevitably constructed in relation to an embedded past that becomes the source and the constraint of their narrative.

That said, following Smith's reading of Butler, it is precisely because of the heterogeneous nature of the self, and because of the multiplicity of the subjects which discursive practices aim to stabilize, that the autobiographical subject is bound to failure (Smith 1995: 20) - a failure of coherence that creates potential variations on reiteration (Smith 1995). Importantly, the performed nature of gender identity as a reiteration of socio-symbolic norms and practices

comes from "the cultural necessity" (McNay 1999b: 177) to sustain the heterosexual imperative and so is a "performance with clearly punitive consequences" (Butler 1988: 522). Performativity, thus, is not a "voluntarist process"; neither is it a one-sided reiteration of symbolic patterns, as the fundamental instability of the symbolic and discursive structures which imbue the body with meaning create possibilities for change (McNay 1999b: 177).

Power, agency and the temporalized *self*

Just as for Butler gender is a constructed identity, a performative repetition of stylized acts for a social audience (Butler 1998), the *mise en scène* of autobiographical performativity, according to Smith, is a sociopolitical platform where the credibility of the story of one's *self* relies on the intelligibility of its content. Inevitably, depending on the audience, "a specific recitation of identity involves the inclusion of certain identity contents and the exclusion of others" (Smith 1995: 20). Scholars of feminist narrative research underline the undeniable role of power dynamics which are present in "constructing all knowledge or stories" (Woodiwiss et al. 2017: 2). Maintaining that stories are "guides for living" and, thus, that the absence of certain narratives impede possibilities for the appearance of different identities, they question how and why certain stories prevail during different periods, but not others (Woodiwiss et al. 2017). Or, to use the term of Molly Andrews, why certain stories are more "tell-able" than others (2010). Therefore, meaning-making personal accounts, when analysed through a lense of narrative inquiry approach, have to be read in relationship to their "socio-cultural context with its hidden power relations, historical discourses and ambiguities (Loots et al. 2013: 110). Importantly, "individuals are never situated upon one axis of subjectification" (McNay 1999a: 329); it is in the ability of an individual to reconcile multiple and sometimes conflicting meanings that the possibility for a creative dimension of agency is established (McNay 1999a: 329).

According to McNay, post-Foucaldian feminist conceptualisations of gender identity tend to priviledge a rather one-dimensional approach to agency and subjectivity and do not provide adequate accounts in evaluating "the individual's capabilities to deal with conflict and difference in terms other than disovowal or repression" (McNay 1999a: 316). It is precisely for its capacity to suggest a more creative understanding of agency that she introduces the

Ricoeurian notion of narrative identity. Her interest lies in the notion of coherence and the gendered self-hood and how it can be applied in understanding "how men and women negotiate the process of gender restructuring that have been unleashed by the de-traditionalising tendencies of late capitalist societies" (McNay 1999a: 315). Essential to her discussion is her engagement with the notion of active appropriation which, she argues, "offers a more autonomous model of agency" (McNay 1999a: 316). More importantly, she discusses the concept of time in relation to a theory of gender and its effects in understanding "the durability of gender identity" (McNay 1999a: 317).

Summary

This thesis therefore positions itself within the school of narrative analysis for a few important reasons. First, acknowledging that historical and cultural conditions play an important role in personal accounts, a narrative approach recognises the agentic work of an individual while engaging in narrating one's experience: "[m]aterial social conditions, discourses and practices interweave with subjectively experienced desires and identities and people make choices, reconstruct pasts and imagine futures within the range of possibilities open to them" (Andrews et al. 2004: 1). Secondly, narrative is an interdisciplinary paradigm as it accommodates interests expressed by scholars of both the social sciences and humanities (Andrews et al. 2004: 2). While the corpus of this thesis consists of investigations of accounts regarding surname changes that come from both the media and semi-structured individual questionnaires, narrative analysis serves as a productive theoretical platform that integrates cultural and social studies and enables an inquiry into how dominant public discourses are being employed, negotiated, challenged and reworked within personal narratives about self-naming. In doing so, it produces an epistemology of discourses regarding contemporary naming practices that delivers insights into ideological dilemmas regarding the gendered, national, and familial identities of contemporary Lithuanian women.

As discussed, during the last three decades the narrative paradigm has found an important place in the field of social science to the point that "it seems as if all social researchers are doing narrative research in some way" (Squire et al. 2013: 1). Therefore, the wide spectrum of conceptualization of narrative inquiry calls for a more precise articulation of the

conceptual framework of this study. Determined to remain cautious in making overinterpreting statements (Squire 2013: 59), this thesis takes the following notions as inspirational for its further development:

1) we all, as narrators, "urgently want and need our narratives to make sense" (Andrews in Freeman 2010: 183)

2) "when we tell stories about our lives, we perform our (preferred) identities" (Riessman in Loots et al. 2013: 109)

3) the use of "often contradictory" mixtures of cultural assets within personal accounts can be seen as symptomatic manifestations of bigger canonical and cultural frameworks (Phoenix 2013: 73).

4) agency is closely intertwined with the temporal dimension of narrative identity: "[t]he retrospective character of narration is closely linked to the prospective horizon of the future and agency arises in part from the tension between the horizon of expectation and the space of experience" (McNay 1999a: 330).

Name - body relationship

While diverse in their definitions of narrative, studies within the field of social science primarily engage with textual accounts: oral or written personal stories, fiction, documentary or explanatory writing (Andrews et al. 2004: 3). However, theoretical contributions from the field of cultural studies have further enriched the concept. Roland Barthes, famously, characterized narrative as also present in "fixed or moving images, gestures [...], myth, legend, fable, tale, novella, epic, history, tragedy, drama, comedy, mime, painting [...], stained glass windows, cinema, comics, news items, conversation." (Barthes in Hyvärinen 2008: 450). In addition, Clive Seale has theorized narratives as more than retrospective accounts of social actions; by rejecting limited understandings of narrative as only belonging to the textual domain, he argues that our bodies - too - can be seen as vehicles through which we construct life narratives (Seale 2004; also Seale 1998).

Narrative scholars - and social constructionists in general - have been criticized for omitting *the body* from their investigations of social identity (Seale 1998; Seale 2004; Hyden 2013). Regardless of the fact that "we tell stories about, in, out of, and through our bodies" (Smith in

Hyden 2013: 126), inquiry into human subjectivity through discourse, while important, seems to regard the body as "endlessly mutable" (Seale 2004: 36) and, thus, delivers an insufficient analysis into how "objective structures can partially determine subjectivity as well as bodily experience" (Seale 1998: 2).

Interestingly, scholars of *naming* from different fields of social sciences have also pointed out the missing attention to the name-body relationship within the majority of studies on naming practices. Anthropologists like Gabriele vom Bruck, inquiring into the absence of anthropological interest in named bodies, argue that they are "manifestations of incorporated knowledge and as such have their own historicity" (Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006: 20). With his interest in personal names as elements of biosocial habitus, anthropologist Gisli Palsson theorizes names as biomarkers that serve as technologies of belonging and exclusion and as such should be integrated into the field of *biopolitics* (Palsson 2014). Palsson argues that, besides the function of categorization and individualization, names are powerful "speech acts" (Austin 1962) - Foucauldian "technologies of the self" - that serve as "means of domination and empowerment, facilitating action, surveillance, and subjugation" (Ingold and Palsson 2013: 36). A growing body of anthropological research on naming practices encourages us to attend to historical and cultural diversity both within systems of patrilineal surnames (Pina-Cabral 2010) and Euro-American contexts, which inform most of the theoretical writing on names. Moreover, their investigations into name-body relationships within systems of naming in, for example, indigenous communities, demonstrate how names serve as "full-blown social actors" that transition from body to body, accumulate and turn a body into a person during ritual bestowals so much so that, in some communities, the act of naming "gives the person to the name" [...] rather than the other way around" (Ingold and Palsson 2013: 34-35).

Thus, anthropological research of naming practices argues that "names embody" (Palsson 2014: 624) and that naming practices engage in a dynamic process of identification (Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck Bruck 2006: 20) which is inevitably embedded in social and political realities (Palsson 2014: 621). They are seen as important elements of "biosocial habitus" (Palsson 2014) as well as perfect manifestations of embodied experience as they

radiate "identification, moral relations, power, the gendering and sexualizing of bodies, and displacement" (Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006: 20).

Responding to the lack of attention to the body within sociological research on names, Jane Pilcher introduces the concept of "embodied named identity" as she maintains that the "body is imbued in naming practices" (Pilcher 2016). According to Pilcher, even though sociologists understand identification as essentially linked to embodiment (Jenkins in Pilcher 2016: 765), few have addressed the binding role of bodies and names in the process of establishing identities (Pilcher 2016; also Pilcher 2017). While revisiting research on naming practices in the UK, she introduces the concept of embodied named identity as a tool to investigate "the individual and social identity of a person as resulting from the enactment, both within and beyond family settings, of a cluster of identificatory social practices of naming that are fundamentally orientated around and rooted in the body" (Pilcher 2016: 766). So, importantly for this thesis, Pilcher sees bodies as an integral part of the social practices of naming, with sexed and gendered bodies being one of the most obvious examples (Pilcher 2016; Pilcher 2017). Sex specific names are common in Western societies and are "speech acts" (Austin 1962) that inflict "primary violence" (Butler in Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck 2006: 17) or, as Pilcher calls them, serve as tools of categorization and negation that, once selected based on the sex of the newborn body, generate a list of social practices "which cumulatively construct embodied femininities and masculinities, along with other social identities" (Pilcher 2016: 768). By *other* identities, Pilcher refers to embodied ethnic or racialized identities that might result in a well-observed phenomenon like racial discrimination (Pilcher 2016: 771). In relation to (heterosexual) marital surname changes of women, Pilcher sees the bodies of women as routinely exposed to numerous speech acts as they are subjected to "intensive social practices of (re)naming (Pilcher 2016: 769). patrilineal surnames, she concludes, is a gendered practice that, besides establishing family and kinship relationships, installs and exposes embodied gender identities (Pilcher 2016: 770).

So, following social science research on naming practices, names embody and engender. They establish social categories, family and kin relationships, legal and social status and ethnicity, and define and maintain structural and ideological hierarchies. In sum, names label bodies and embody knowledge. Importantly, they only fulfill their social and cultural function

when in relationship to the corporeal form of an individual[33]. Its symbolic content, on the other hand, accumulates in dynamic sequels of identification practices among the members/bodies of particular social and political environments.

While developing the concept of embodied named identity, Pilcher employs the work of Chris Shiller (2008) and his engagement with pragmatism in sociological explorations of "body-subjects in their social contexts" (Shilling in Pilcher 2016: 776). Borrowing Shilling's framework of *habit, crisis and creativity*, Jane Pilcher (2017) theorizes surname changes at marriage as one of the "crisis points"[34] that challenge embodied gender identities and call for a reflective response that might result in a "normative and compliant, pragmatic, or creative and resistant [naming] practices" (2017). Acknowledging the role of patrilineal power frameworks that expect women to change their surnames, Pilcher sees women's choice of surname at marriage as an embodied doing - or creative re-doing - of gender (Pilcher 2017).

The affective turn

Recently, social science research has been experiencing "a turn to affect" related to its interest in the embodied, affective experiences of subjectivity (McAvoy 2015: 23). Feminist theorists in particular have turned their attention to questions of affect and the subjective experiences of beauty (Coleman and Moreno Figueroa 2010). On the one hand, they have been asking Foucauldian - or, more broadly, discursive - questions concerning the role of affect in power and technologies of subject formation, seeking to understand "how passions like desire, rage, love or shame are bound up with subjecthood and how power operates through and mobilises effect" (Elias et al. 2017: 17). Or, as Jean McAvoy puts it, "how discourse becomes internalised in such a way that it activates feelings" (McAvoy 2015: 23). Consequently, this approach enriches psychosocial understandings of the relationship between situated subjectivities and, for example, beauty in its claim that our individual preferences have "everything to do with [our] daily exposure to a cultural habitat or images that relentlessly shapes [our] tastes, desires and what [we] find beautiful" (Gill 2007: 73)

[33] In some cases, they even replace the missing body in order to establish social identity; As an ultimate example of the fact that names socialize and embed us as social beings - as is discussed in relation to lost pregnancies cases (Layne in vom Bruck and Bodenhorn 2006)
[34] Besides birth, divorce and gender-identity transitions

On the other hand, a Deleuzian or non-representational approach asks questions that focus on "embodied affective processes" (Coleman and Figueroa in Elias et al. 2017: 17). According to Elias et al., feminist scholars that work with a Deleuzian approach "are radically reconfiguring the kinds of questions that are asked about beauty" (2017: 18). Claire Colebrook (2006), for example, suggests that feminist theory should focus on pragramtic rather than moral questions in relation to beauty: "how is beauty defined, deployed, defended, subordinated, marked or manipulated, and how do these tactics intersect with gender and value?" (in Elias et al. 2017: 18). Extremely important for my later analysis of narratives of naming is the work of Rebecca Coleman and Mónica Moreno Gigueroa (2010) on the *temporal dimension* in women's experience of beauty. Drawing on two different sets of data[35], they conclude that "beauty is an inclination towards a perfected temporal state" (Coleman and Figueroa in Elias et al. 2017: 18). Moreover, it is theorized as a 'bodily inclination' that is closely intertwined with the notion of hope: "as such an inclination, hope is a productive way of understanding how beauty is located in times other than the present" (Coleman and Figueroa 2010: 361)[36].

Names as commodities

Seale argues that while our material/animal life is the primal agent through which we experience culture, the social life of objects has a valid place in narrative inquiry: "[o]bjects can be ordered in relation to the body, the household, a life, in ways that make narrative sense" (Seale 2004: 37). Consequently, Seale's definition of narrative also includes "acts of consumption, for example, which can be made symbolically to tell stories about tastes, relationships (whether real or desired) or social standing" (Seale in Hyvärinen: 2007: 448). One could argue that family names of women could also be perceived as objects or commodities that, while related to a specific body, serve as one of the symbolic acts of consumption that contribute to constructing a personal story about one's social identity. Scholars investigating personal names of children have argued that, just like other consumer goods, personal names have a capacity to both personalize and socialize the carrier of the

[35] With white British girls and mestizo Mexican women;

[36] While this thesis is largely informed by a psychosocial - or Foucauldian - approach to subject construction in narratives of self-naming, a Deleuzian-inflected approach to beauty as, first and foremost, a temporal dimension will be used in the final chapters of this thesis.

name (Lieberson 2000; Layne 2006). They - too - "go in and out of fashion" and have a capacity to "mark a child's place in the social order in terms of gender, class (and/or class aspirations), ethnic background, religious community, and often general cohort" (Layne 2006).

When it comes to understanding family names of women as arbitrary commodities, one needs to acknowledge that the list women choose their surnames from depends on a specific historical moment and varies from country to country. However, one of the common motives of keeping or changing one's surname (after marriage) has been the symbolic value of the present (or the perspective) family name (see for example Clarke et al. 2008). This practice was already common in Middle Ages[37] and - being compatible with the rationality of neoliberal capitalism - seems to have maintained its place within public and individual discourse. During the suffragist movement in America, for example, actresses, singers and writers were "excused" for maintaining their names as signs of individuality because it has "some merchantable value" (Garisson in Omi 1997: 188). Today, studies on naming show that having an established *name* within a job market is a strong predictor for a woman to maintain her maiden surname upon marriage (Goldin and Shim 2004; see also Noack and Wiik 2008; Scheuble and Johnson 1993) - a concept that - as the case of Natalija Bunkė/Zvonkė demonstrates - could be referred to as branding or rebranding of one's social identity.

As it has been briefly mentioned in the Introduction of this thesis, in 2005, Natalija Zvonkė née Natalija Ivanova - the leader of (then) popular pop band YVA - became one of the most talked-about women in Lithuania due to her choice of an unusual family name following her eccentric wedding to a Lithuanian music producer Deivydas Zvonkus. Her decision to obtain the non-suffixed version of her husband's surname has caused ridicule and outrage that resulted in a public petition to the Lithuanian Parliament. Natalija Zvonkė née Natalija Ivanova has slowly moulded her new marital identity into a brand which serves her until this

[37] Scholars of naming understand surnames as a social construct - a Foucauldian scheme of knowledge, first and foremost, serving systems of power (Scott et al 2002: 6). This is due to the fact that, depending on the social background, the use of patrilineal names seems to have been influenced by different (but not exclusive of each other) social projects, such as the building of the social status or the building of the modern state (see Caplan 2001; Scot et al. 2002).

day. By obtaining the new version of female surname, she has gained the symbolic respectability attached to the institution of marriage (Skeggs 2004: 126), has received a possibility to "bask in the reflected glory of her husband's name" (Clarke et al 2008) and, thus, has established a new social identity that has served her as 1) her legal identity, 2) a signifier of symbolic distinction (Bourdieu 2013 (1984)) and 3) a stage name. Consequently, I would argue that Natalija Zvonkė represents what Michele Lazar has called a gendered practice of "symbolic entrepreneurship" (2017). While she has since divorced her first husband (2010), re-married (2011) and then divorced (2013) the second one, she has publicly transitioned from being named as Natalija Ivanova to Natalija Zvonkė and then, after her second marriage, to Natalija Bunkė (as she has chosen the non-suffixed marital surname of her second husband Danielius Bunkus). While responding to a question which surname she intends to choose after her second divorce she admits having seriously considered returning to her previous surname Zvonkė as it had served and carries on serving her as a widely recognized brand.

Similarly, referring to feminist criticism that Amal Alamuddin (now Clooney) has received for taking her husband's surname after the marriage, one Internet blogger has elaborated on her own choice of taking her husband's surname as a possibility to have a surname that - finally - feels much closer to her *personal brand*[38]. Along the lines of neoliberal discourse that, in the contemporary world, it is consumption that defines one's identity (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008), she claims that "when we choose our names, we get to choose who we want to be. My real surname made me a target for school bullies. It makes me feel fat, weak and awkward"[39]. Similarly to the *Alamuddin - Clooney* transition, opting for a certain surname could also be perceived as an act of embodiment that tells a story about one's ethnic or racial background. As one newspaper interviewee explained, "it's not necessarily a feminist reason, but it's just my name for 33 years of my life. [...] Plus, I'm Asian and he's

[38] Buchanan, Daisy. "Amal is taking her husband's name, and so am I. We are anything but weak." *The Telegraph,* Oct. 15, 2014, www.telegraph.co.uk/women/womens-life/11163652/Amal-Clooney-Why-is-it-weak-to-take-your-husbands-surname.html [accessed Jun. 6, 2017]
[39] Ibid.

not, so it's less confusing for me to have a white name"[40][41]. One could see how, in relation the notion that personal names establish social categories that determine how a person will be known/seen/legible *as,* these women try to renegotiate social meanings attached to their names and how, importantly, these social meanings are closely intertwined with the materiality of these named bodies.

Additionally, I would argue that these accounts serve as great examples of how women do identity work as they try to integrate a change that comes with new marital status into their personal biography. Working around cultural knowledge related to a feminist identity (and, in the last case, performatively distancing from it), they struggle to re-configure their social identities in close relationship to their biographical past and the immediate future. Importantly, their social identities and their biographies are perceived as inseparable from the materiality of their bodies and makes it possible to argue that *narrative identity* - as understood through self-naming practices - should be perceived as a corporal experience.

These accounts demonstrate how "names connote embodied, often racialized, identities" (Pilcher 2016: 771) and can sometimes reveal a sense of dissonance between the name and the body it describes. While, in the first instance, one's *real* surname is perceived to be describing an undesirable "fat, weak and awkward" body, the latter account - among other things - appeals to a sense of discrepancy that would be produced by transracial naming or "contradictory embodiment" (Connell in Pilcher 2016).

Conclusions

According to Gail Weiss, the postmodernist tradition has successfully established the notion that "the body [...] is a text" (2003: 25). As socio-symbolic norms and practices through which "the body comes to bear cultural meanings" (Butler 1998: 520), personal names, as Pilcher reminds us, are inseparable from the "body as a purely material, biological organism" (Weiss 2003: 25). Narratives of self-naming, therefore, as much as they are embedded in

[40] Cain Miller. Claire and Derek Willis. "Maiden Names, on the Rise Again." *The New York Times,* June 27, 2015, www.nytimes.com/2015/06/28/upshot/maiden-names-on-the-rise-again.html [accessed June 29, 2015]
[41] In Chapter ? of this thesis I will elaborate on the use of cross-ethnic surnames in contemporary Lithuania

historically situated cultural structures that dictate, impede and support possible lines of "tell-ability" (Andrews 2010), are equally *affected* by the inevitable permanence of the gendered body. A permanence that is bound to change through time (McNay 1999a: 316). White, heterosexual men, as Pilcher has argued, "have the strongest, most consistent, embodied named identities over their life courses" (2017: 820). Women who belong to communities of practices with patrilineal expectations are, however, expected to experience (sometimes multiple) crisis points (Pilcher 2017) such as marriage, divorce or remarriage that unsettle the relative stability of their narrative identity (Ricoeur 1991). As biographical accounts concerned with gendered identity, narratives of self-naming, therefore, operate as performative spaces where *the structural, the cultural and the subjective* dimensions of gender are reconsidered in relation to "the active and constraining presence of the past [and] the uncertainties of the immediate future" (McNay 1999a: 317). Importantly, the body functions as a "narrative horizon" (Weiss 2003: 26) for the stories of naming as "that which frustrates our attempts at narrative unity, while simultaneously making the quest for narrative coherence possible" (Weiss 2003: 33).

PART II: Gender and Language ideology - the Lithuanian surname as a national frontier

I think that the first task should be to form a national opinion that it is a shameful crime of its citizens to tolerate their mother tongue's mutilation

Aleksandras Vanagas (1990)[42]

Introduction

Nationalism is the founding paradigm of modern Lithuanian identity (Donskis 2002: 34). And the Lithuanian language has played a key role in establishing, perpetuating and - more than once in the history of Lithuania - sustaining the integrity of what contemporary scholars call the "mythologized ethno-linguistic identity" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018). Established by the conservative Catholic nationalism of the 1930s, this language discourse had been perpetuated and institutionalized through the processes of language planning in post-independence Lithuania forming a phenomenon that is not comparable to other postsocialist countries in its institutionalized power and language surveillance (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018). Nationalist language ideologies are usually closely intertwined with symbolic constructions of certain kinds of femininity (Cameron 2003). Based on the interwar anti-Western and anti-modern rhetoric (Donskis 2002), Lithuanian language ideology sees Lithuanian women as "chief guardian[s] and repository of national spirit and ethnic tradition" (Marcinkevičienė in Balkelis 2009: 78). While Soviet family and gender ideologies inevitably affected, subverted and commodified existing gender and language ideologies (on language Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018; on Soviet gender ideologies Marcinkevičienė 2009), the post-independence processes of "intense

[42] in Tamaševičius 2016;

nation-building conflicted with [...] efforts at the European integration" (Sloboda et al. 2018: 261).

Lithuanian surnames and especially the "unique" suffixes of female surnames are constructed as an untouchable "cultural stuff"[43] within the hegemonic language ideology. However, as it has been discussed, in 2003, the Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson and the EU directives agreed to legitimize non-suffixed female surnames to be used next to the traditional suffixed female surnames (Miliūnaitė 2013: 329). However, this decision was received controversially by society and "discussions whether the traditional system of surnames had to be abandoned still continues" (Miliūnaitė 2013: 329). The emerging dissatisfaction with existing suffixes in traditional female surnames in other post-socialist societies (in Czech Republic and Slovakia) also suggests that traditional female surnames can be theorized as an analytical category where language and gender identities are reproduced, challenged and reversed when confronted with other - often competing - ideologies. Moreover, as both hegemonic and competing ideologies on language and gender serve as collective resources through which people make sense of their social life (Cameron 2003: 464), an historized approach to discourse and language ideologies highlights the historical embeddedness of certain discourses and, most importantly, makes it possible to locate moments of "'bottom-up' strategies of those who may contest or subvert those ideologies through creative appropriation or production of new discourses" (Bucholtz 2003: 58). Consequently, as this thesis is an inquiry into narratives of women who have chosen the non-suffixed surname, thus challenging the traditional role assigned to them by nationalist gender and language ideologies, an extensive investigation into the genealogies of available collective resources in their construction of narratives of self-naming is essential as it demonstrates that 1) "neither discourse nor ideology is ever finished" and 2) "that both can repeatedly enter new configurations that may constitute gender in unanticipated ways" (Bucholtz 2003: 58).

[43] "as Chatterjee (1986) has pointed out, an essentialist view of 'culture' as having specific fixed 'cultural stuff' of symbols, ways of behaviour and artefacts which coherently and unproblematically constitute cultures of specific national and ethnic collectivities" (in Yuval-Davis 2017)

Theoretical framework: Language ideology, gender and nation

Language and gender

As a study of narratives of self-naming by contemporary Lithuanian women, this thesis is first and foremost a study of language and gender. Following the disciplinary tradition established by feminist discourse analysis, its main interest lies in critical explorations of how gender identities are produced, reproduced and challenged through language or discourse (Bucholtz 2003: 57).

Scholars of critical discourse analysis have extensively argued that language is a primary vehicle for production and reproduction of ideology - "belief systems that come to be accepted as 'common sense'" (Bucholtz 2003: 57). Based on the theoretical paradigms of Marxist and post-structuralist theories of language, critical discourse analysis is particularly interested in different domains of power production that have strong, not merely symbolic, but also material effects on the lives of human beings (Bucholtz 2003: 57). Media is one of those domains that hold power in the production and distribution of discourse to promote interests of hegemonic groups, overshadowing other - politically marginalized - subjects, such as people of racial and ethnic minorities, the lower classes, children, and women (Bucholtz 2003: 58). Consequently, feminist critical discourse analysis focuses on how ideologies of gender are "embedded in the most pervasive forms of discourse" (Bucholtz 2003: 58).

However, while naming practices are themselves embedded within the language domain, a study of discursive constructions about self-naming invites a study of language ideologies; examination of texts and practices "in which languages are represented - not only spoken and written but also spoken and written about" (Cameron 2003: 448). This is particularly true in relation to the contemporary Lithuanian language ideology which, as will be discussed in this chapter, prides itself on the exceptionality and uniqueness of its family name system. Consequently, one could argue that accounts about surname change, besides

discursively engaging with notions of gender, national, ethnic and class identities *through language*, are also discursive configurations that reproduce, subvert or contest dominant ideologies about the language itself. They can be approached as cultural texts and practices in which languages are represented. As one of those cultural domains that produce metadiscourse - a discourse about discourse (Bucholtz 2003: 58) - in which dominant representations of language that circulate within culture serve as collective resources "for the work of producing identities" (Cameron 2003: 464). Consequently, inquiring into the historicity of hegemonic representations of language ideology is crucial in understanding 1) how certain aspects about the language are conventionally perceived within the culture, 2) whether and how habitual representations of language are contested and 3) what new alternatives are created (Cameron 2003: 448).

Mary Bucholtz argues that critical discourse analysis - as a primarily textual inquiry into discourse - rarely demonstrates the further cultural life of discourse and encourages us to track its movement through time and space in engaging in a study of language ideologies (2003: 58). This thesis therefore aims to bring discursive practices (such as narratives of self-naming) and language ideologies together and situate them "within the mesh of culture and history" (Bucholtz 2003: 60).

While the corpus of this thesis engages with discursive constructions of contemporary Lithuanian women in relation to their marital surname change, this chapter is concerned with how contemporary Lithuanian language ideology has been institutionalized and has come to be accepted as *common sense* through various domains of power (Bucholtz 2003: 57). By engaging with various historical constructions of Lithuanian language ideology, it aims to *historicize* the discourse and, consequently, produce an inquiry into whether and "how [language] ideologies are taken up, interrupted, or rerouted by those who participate in metadiscourse in various ways" (Bucholtz 2003: 59). This is particularly important in relation to the assertion that, according to Deborah Cameron, many ideological representations of language "belong to a 'double discourse' in which language is simultaneously both itself and a symbolic substitute for something else" (2003: 448). More often than not, the symbolic dimension of language ideologies is invested in cultural discourses on gender (Gal in Cameron 2003: 449).

From the most culturally persistent language ideology that essentializes (and promotes) the notion that men and women use language differently, to more subtle intracultural variations that affiliate different linguistic behaviour to different kind of femininity, hegemonic discourses on language and gender "are specific to time and place: they vary across cultures and historical periods, and [...] are inflected by representations of other social characteristics such as class and ethnicity" (Cameron 2003: 452; see also Bucholtz 2003: 60). Most importantly, they serve in legitimizing both gender differences *and* gender hierarchies (Cameron 2003: 452). As Bucholtz sums up, assumptions about language are also about gender, and vice versa (2003: 60). Importantly, "ideology is never total or foreclosed to other, countervailing ideologies" (Bucholtz 2003: 60).

According to Cameron, the discourse of ancestral vernacular languages as holding the key to communal identities is one of the most widely circulated language ideologies that, historically tied to political ideologies of nationalism, "remains salient in the post-colonial and post-Cold War debates of the present day" (Cameron 2003: 447). Unsurprisingly, as this chapter reveals, this is also the discursive matrix of Lithuanian nationalist paradigm. Consequently, an investigation into the gendered dimension of nationalist projects can further enrich an understanding of gender identities as symbolic domains where nationalist and language ideologies intersect and are constructed in relation to each other.

Gender and nationalist ideologies

In aiming to provide a gendered understanding of nations and nationalism, Nira Yuval-Davis examines how gender relations contribute in such dimensions of nationalist projects as national reproduction, national culture and national citizenship (1997: 3). While major scholars of nationalism tend to classify various nationalist projects into rigid categories of *Kulturnation* and *Staatnation*, her study develops a number of analytical intersections that introduce a framework "for discussing and analysing the different ways in which the discourse on gender and that on nation tend to intersect and to be constructed by each other" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 4). Importantly, the gendered constitution of the nation is analysed as

relational with respect to the "shifting nationalist discourse promoted by different groupings competing for hegemony" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 4).

The role of women as biological bearers of the nation is one of the most popular intersections within various historical projects of nation building (Yuval-Davis 1997: 26). While most ethnic and nationalist projects rely on genealogy and common origin, being born is usually the only/way to enter ethnic or national collectivities. Consequently, the function of women, depending on nationalist policies of population control, are constructed and re-fashioned via pronatalist, Eugenicist or Malthusian discourses (Yuval-Davis 1997).

The other common way of imagining nations (Anderson 1983) is through notions of culture and tradition (Yuval-Davis 1997: 23). Understood as a historically situated composition of a specific religion or/and a specific language, the culture and tradition dimension is a significant essentializing measure through which a mythical unity of imagined communities is established and re-produced (Yuval-Davis 1997: 23). Women - and gendered bodies in general - in this culturalized discourse "play pivotal roles as territories, markers and reproducers of the narratives of the nations and other collectives" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 39). Constructed as symbolic bearers of collectivities identity, destiny and honour[44], women are assigned the role of intergenerational reproducers of the culture (Yuval-Davis 1997: 67) and are often expected to carry a burden of representation[45] both personally and collectively (Yuval-Davis 1997: 45). And while certain political and global processes (such as decolonization or globalisation) inevitably initiate changes in hegemonic structural and cultural dynamics, women are often assigned the role of the carrier of traditions (Yuval-Davis 1997: 61). Importantly, various appropriations of cultural stuff "play crucial roles in the continuous (re)construction of collectivities and collective identities and the management/control of their boundaries" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 67).

Another intersectional dimension that Yuval-Davis discusses in her study of the gendered nature of nationalist projects is that of national citizenship. As "a criterion for membership

[44] Yuval-Davis discusses how a figure of a woman, often a mother, in many countries is chosen to symbolize both the spirit of collectivity and, together with children, the collective imagination of the future (Yuval-Davis 1997: 45).
[45] From Kubena Mercer (1990) in Yuval-Davis 1997.

in the national collectivity" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 23), state citizenship is seen as the most inclusive form of participation in a collectivity (Yuval-Davis 1997: 24). However, as Yuval-Davis herself warns, while an inclusive category of collective membership, it cannot be productively analyzed without taking into consideration the dimensions of *Volknation* and *Kulturnation* (Yuval-Davis 1997: 69). Using T.H. Marshall's definition of citizenship as full membership in the community, she theorizes it as an analytical category that epitomizes the relationship between the individual and the state (Yuval-Davis 1997: 68).

Scholars of the history of Western family name systems have argued that patrilineal practices developed as one of the social projects essential to modern state formation that, next to such practices as cadastral surveys, property registers, national censuses and currencies, were supposed to establish legal identities (Scott et al. 2002). Consequently, in relation to Lithuanian ethnolinguistic nationalism, surnames, rather than tools of categorization, are an analytical category that can be seen as a conjunctive phenomenon in all three above mentioned levels of nation-building: through genealogy, cultural imagination and citizenship (Yuval-Davis 1997). Consequently, historicizing the role of language/name ideologies and their gendered dimension within nationalist discourse enriches an inquiry into Lithuanian women's self-naming practices as both discursive constructions of multiple subjectivities *and* metadiscursive practices that engage with language ideologies as they move through time and space, inevitably confronting other - often competing - ideologies[46].

Up until 1990, except for the thirty-year period of independence between the World wars, "Lithuania was always [...] either occupied by a foreign force or formed joint states with neighbouring countries. During the twentieth century, Lithuania changed hands three times, one repressive regime succeeding another, and was subjected to the Soviet system for half of the century" (Kačkutė 2015: 87). A history that, as Lithuanian psychiatrist Danutė Gailienė argues, can be qualified as traumatizing (in Kačkutė 2015: 87). Therefore, an inquiry into genealogy of discourses in relation to various linguistic practices needs to consider how different systems of knowledge, belief and power (following Foucault) are employed, challenged and subverted as language/naming ideologies "move through time and space" (Bucholtz 2003). It also needs to consider how different symbolic artifacts of the colonial

[46] Such as feminism, postcolonialism or neoliberalism.

past - consciously or unconsciously - inform or, as Violeta Kelertas (2006) calls it, *fuse* with emerging gender, ethnic and nationalist identities. I would argue that a postcolonial approach to the inquiry into language/naming ideologies helps to recognize how and which different and, often, competing political ideologies are simultaneously at work within certain cultural and political domains.

The postcolonial approach

It is still unusual to relate to the Baltic States[47] - or the whole post-Soviet block in general - as a postcolonial realm (Kelertas 2006: 1). As David Chioni Moore observed, "The enormous twenty-seven-nation post-Soviet sphere – including both former Soviet Republics and "East Bloc" states – are virtually never discussed in the substantial Western discourse of postcolonial studies" (in Kelertas 2006: 11). However, the last decade saw a growing number of scholars who have been engaged in the application of postcolonial perspectives to the post-Soviet societies (Annus 2018; Kačkutė 2015; Baločkaitė 2008; Kelertas 2006). Arguing that the Soviet Union was a decidedly expansionist colonizer that applied a list of "blunt instruments aimed at the ideological transformation" (Verdery in Kelertas 2006: 5) of annexed countries, they admit there is a need to fill a scholarly void in relation to the understanding of the Baltic States within the postcolonial paradigm: "we must formulate new ideas of nationalism, postcoloniality, and multiculturalism in terms of the diversified, centuries-old imperial history of the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Russian Federation" (Spivak in Kelertas 2006: 4).

Importantly for this thesis, Kelertas engages with the writing of Bill Ashcroft and his rethinking of postcolonialism as representing a form of talk rather than a form of experience - a notion that reads postcolonial discourse as a Foucauldian system of knowledge of colonized societies (Ashcroft in Kelertas 2006: 8). Consequently, scholars of Baltic postcolonialism investigate how postcolonial discourse fuses, internalizes or, to use Homi Bhabha, unconsciously mimics "the colonizer's view of the world" (Kelertas 2006: 6).

[47] Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

According to Moore, one of the main expressions of post-Soviet postcoloniality is compensatory behaviour as manifested in "an exaggerated desire for authentic sources, generally a mythic set of heroic, purer ancestors who once controlled a greater zone than the people now possess" (Moore 2001: 118). As it is argued in this chapter, Lithuanian mythologized ethnolinguistic identity has been built and reproduced extensively on this postcolonial paradigm. On the other hand, scholars of post-socialist post-colonialism underline that, in Central and Eastern Europe, discourses of *de*colonization are typical of postcolonial desire that is directed not on the fallen master Russia, but on the narrative of return to Westerness that once was theirs (Moore 2001: 118). Rephasing Homi Bhabha who described colonial mimesis of subjugated peoples as coming from the desire to be accepted, recognized an integrated, Rasa Baločkaitė argues that enthusiastic proclamation of the *West* as a new source of truth and legitimacy is a colonial mimesis that is expressed through "the discourse of return to Europe" (2008). This is how Baločkaitė describes the pathos with which Lithuanians celebrated the day it joined the European Union: "[c]oncerts and festive events continued for several days, but the culminating moment was "The Action of Light". People throughout the country were asked to turn on all lights in their homes, offices, villas and cars at midnight - satellite pictures were to show Lithuania as 'the lightest state of new Europe'" (Baločkaitė 2008: 5). Consequently, in my analysis of historical discourses on language and gender ideologies - and the role of naming practices within those discourses - postcolonial discourse is used in order to understand and interpret how nationalist and *Western* discourses work in relation to each other and how they affect emerging gender identities.

Creative guidelines

Cameron develops a list of questions that should guide an essay about gender and (nationalist) language ideologies. She encourages an analyst to investigate "how has the relationship between language and gender been represented in different times [...] and what purposes have been served by representing it in particular ways?" (2003: 464). Also, "[h]ave political (feminist) interventions succeeded in changing the repertoire of representations?" (Cameron 2003: 464). Finally, "[how] and to what extent do ideological representations of the language/gender relationship inform everyday linguistic and social practices among real

women and men?" (Cameron 2003: 464). Using the above listed questions as creative guidelines for this thesis, in this chapter, I aim to develop an inquiry into *the first one* by developing critical genealogies of discourses that are embedded in the Lithuanian ethnolinguistic nationalism, a sacred place of traditional family names within this discourse, and the gendered dimension of those ideologies as they are contested and affected by competing historical and political agendas.

Development of ethno-linguistic national identity

According to Terry D. Clark, "Lithuanian history is marked by an early period of expansionist glory, gradual decline, eventual cultural subjugation, and a prolonged struggle to develop and reassert a national identity" (2006: 163). Centuries of cultural cohabitation with Poland and [expansionist] aggression of tsarist Russia and the USSR contributed heavily to the fact that, until today, the Lithuanian language is treated as a national myth, a symbol, an ultimate measure determining inclusion: "the Lithuanian language serves more than as a means for transmitting culture. It is itself virtually the only way of identifying that one is or is not culturally Lithuanian" (Clark 2006: 181).

One of the largest European states of the fourteenth century, in 1386, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania formed the union with Poland forming the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Clark 2006: 163). A multi-ethnic and multilingual state at the time, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania used Latin and Slavonic (Ruthenian) language as its administrative language (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018). However, the rapid fusion of nobility between what had been separate social and political bodies resulted in a Polish cultural domination; so much so that by the end of the 17th century Polish becomes the official state language, "while Lithuanian had been largely relegated to the status of a language spoken by the illiterate peasant population" (Clark 2006: 163).

And so when the ultimate partition led the Lithuanian territory into the Russian Empire[48], it was the Polonized upper class that carried out the Insurrection of 1831, the aim of which

[48] Among the Russian Empire, Kingdom of Prussia and Austria in 1795 (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 193).

was to restore the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Clark 2006: 163). According to historians, the real Lithuanian national awakening[49] was fueled by the abolition of serfdom in the Russian Empire and accompanying social and educational reforms that facilitated a rapid upward social mobility of the Lithuanian-speaking lower classes and, differently from the Lithuanian nobility and gentry, "they rejected both Polish and Russian culture" (Clark 2006: 164; see also Balkelis 2009). The subsequent Insurrection of 1863, thus, was led by a group of *new* intellectuals and professionals who fought for an independent Lithuanian state (my italics) (Clark 2006: 164).

The Insurrection of 1863 was followed by a severe tsarist response that included executions, deportations and the ban of the Latin alphabet, which meant that "no publication in the Lithuanian language was permitted"[50] (Clark 2006: 164) - a policy that, according to historians "helped to identify the language as central to the [Lithuanian] national identity" (Stukas in Clark 2006: 164; Also Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018)[51]. The ban on publishing in the Lithuanian language prompted the appearance of several illegal Lithuanian-language periodicals[52] led by so called "New Lithuanians"[53] who, besides battling assimilation, were also dismissing reunification with Poland (Clark 2006: 164; More on the development of the new intelligentsia in Balkelis 2009). The slogan "Out with all Germanisms and Slavicisms" that was published in one of the first issues of the first national newspaper *Auszra* (Dawn)[54] also came across as a call to defend the national identity from the politically dominant German (in the Lithuanian part of Prussia), Russian and particularly Polish cultures[55] (Tamaševičius 2016: 244).

---

[49] "Something seen in much of East Central Europe during the nineteenth century" (Clark 2006: 193).
[50] From 1864-1904;
[51] "During the period several illegal Lithuanian-language periodicals emerged urging national resistance to assimilation and rejecting reunification with Poland. The intensity of the resistance to the Russian Empire is most evidenced in the willingness of many to school their children in the Lithuanian language despite serious punishment" (Clark 2006: 164).
[52]Also, books and periodicals were brought illegally from East Prussia, where Lithuanian was not forbidden (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 194).
[53] More in Balkelis (2009: 2).
[54] Published in East Prussia from 1883 to 1886
[55] According to Leonidas Donskis, Lithuanian linguistic and cultural nationalism, besides fighting against Russian, Polish and German cultural and political influences, also created an alienating domain in relationship to Lithuania's large Jewish community (Donskis 2002: 23). Known around the world as the Jerusalem of the North, the Lithuanian capital Vilnius (occupied by Poland between 1920-1939) was home to many internationally distinguished Jews "who inscribed Lithuania's name of the intellectual and cultural map of the twentieth-century world" (Donskis 2002: 23). However, these prominent intellectuals - partly because of their Russian and Yiddish speaking background - were left on the cultural periphery of Lithuanian inter-war

Besides the above mentioned historical reasons, a special (romanticised) place for the language within the nationalist discourse at the end of nineteenth-century[56] was supported by scholarly investigations into the historical value of Lithuanian language as contemporary German scholars of comparative linguistics found many connections between Lithuanian language and the ancient[57] Sanskrit (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 196). While the authors of the academic grammars in German did not argue that Lithuanian is the oldest living Indo-European language[58], the narrative of the antique and *archaic* Lithuanian turned into "a piece of received wisdom for both Lithuanian nationalists and a significant number of philologists" (Spires in Tamaševičius 2015: 244). The subsequent processes of language standardization were therefore strongly supported by "the cultural myth of the antiquity of the Lithuanian language" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 197). Standard Lithuanian, for one, was built on a dialect that was understood as the most archaic version of the language available at the time (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018).

It is during the period of press ban that the Lithuanian language underwent an orthography reform (Walkowiak 2016: 314). Similarly to other national elites in Eastern Europe at the time, the Lithuanian intelligentsia created an entire subculture of the literati- a litery public space directed to the Lithuanian speaking imaginary community (Balkelis 2009: 91). Consequently, as their readership was complaining about the incomprehensibility of the language used, the standardisation of the Lithuanian language was initiated (Balkelis 2009: 47). A spoken language since the Middle Ages, Lithuanian embraced the Latin script and existing Polish spelling; however, as a big part of the national upheaval agenda included

intelligentsia (Donskis 2002: 23). Donskis emphasizes that the exclusion of an important ethnic group from the paradigm of national uprising was also heavily influenced by the popular contemporary binarism between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*: to the rurally oriented Lithuanian intelligentsia of early twenties century, which cherished their descent from the peasantry, Jewish community represented a diverse society of "'rootless', cosmopolitan and urban professionals" (Donskis 2002: 23). Donskis makes an important observation that this *anti-cosmopolitan* and *anti-modern* (anti-semitic) rhetoric was significantly strengthened and enhanced during the later interwar period, when Lithuanian mainstream nationalism established a strong *ideological kinship* with the Roman Catholic Church (2002: 24).

[56] Something that, historians note, was common for the whole region (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018)

[57] A narrative that will be appearing often in relation to the Lithuanian language and in relation to female surnames in particular.

[58] "In fact Lithuanian is positioned by scholars within the Balto-Slavic group of languages, most closely related to Slavic – not to Latin, which is an Italic language, or to Sanskrit, which is classified within the Indo-Iranian group" (Walkowiak 2016: 340).

rejecting Polish and German influences[59], the fathers of standard Lithuanian replaced the Polish *cz*, *sz* and *ż* with Czech (!) *č*, *š* and *ž* respectively (Walkowiak 2016: 316). Also, and importantly to my further discussion on Polish surnames in Lithuania, to *spite the Poles*, *v* was introduced instead of *w* and *l* - in the place of *ł* (Walkowiak 2016: 316). Therefore, as a by-product of what Benedict Anderson (1983) has called the creation of a nation via the printed word, normative grammar of Lithuanian was conceived in 1901 by Jonas Jablonskis, and, when the press ban was lifted in 1904, the Lithuanian language looked very different: "in the place of digraphs, there were letters with carons and there was no *w* or *ł*" (Walkowiak 2016: 317).

The interwar period

By the time a group of intellectuals declared the formation of the Republic of Lithuania in 1918, Lithuanian was already established as its national language (Clark 2006; Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018). This legitimized what sociolinguistic scholars call Lithuanian linguistic nationalism that was preoccupied with "the fight for the survival of the Lithuanian language, its revitalization and development" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 196).

Leonidas Donskis has argued that, while highly invested in linguistic and cultural nationalism, intellectuals of the early twentieth century cultivated a rather inclusive and liberal perception of national identity (Donskis 2002: 23). Scholars of language planning also agree that, at first, attempts "to create a standard language community were not directed against other languages or speakers of them or against Lithuanian dialects" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 196). The later interwar period, however, saw a radical transformation of Lithuanian nationalism "from a nation-building process into an authoritarian identity politics discourse" (Donskis 2002: 24). As a consequence, this period saw a more politicized language policy conducted towards the Polish-speaking Vilnius region (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 197) - a contested segment in the development of Lithuanian national identity (Clark 2006: 164).

[59] See Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018 for a detailed analysis of the process.

Historically populated by the Polonized upper class and home to Vilnius University - a hub of Polish culture - the region of Vilnius was seized by Poland in 1920. An annexation of the densely Polonized capital[60] region was supported by many locals (Clark 2006: 164). In fact, one of the biggest challenges during the interwar period was that "much of the country's intelligentsia, gentry, and townspeople demonstrated an attachment to Polish culture as well as the idea of union with Poland" (Clark 2006: 166). Furthermore, a military coup performed by The Union of Nationalists in 1926 created more ethnic (as well as class) tension by forcibly overthrowing a left-wing government predominantly supported by the country's Poles and Jews (Clark 2006: 164). The near-dictatorial powers given to the newly installed president meant that "leftist parties were virtually denied the right to political participation for the remainder of the interwar period" (Eidintas in Clarks 2006: 165).

And it was the conservative Catholic nationalism of the 1930s - on which the exclusive authoritarian ideology of Antanas Smetona[61] was built - that equated Lithuanian identity with being Roman Catholic (2002: 24). Important as it later became in keeping Lithuanian identity alive during the Soviet occupation, this conservative nationalist paradigm imported "anti-Western and anti-modern rhetoric [that saw] the West and its derivative phenomena - capitalism, the bourgeoisie, liberal democracy, secularisation of consciousness, pluralism [as] incompatible with Christian values, national culture, and Lithuanian spirituality" (Donskis 2002: 26). And while religious resistance served as one of the main tenets of national continuity during the Soviet occupation, the interwar conservative formula of Roman Catholic Lithuanian identity had been appropriated "to become an essentially defensive phenomenon of [national] consciousness" (Donskis 2002: 25).

Discussion of Slavic/Polish surnames

Historical or contemporary, virtually all discussions related to the Lithuanian personal and family names are somehow related to the "Polish question". The surname of the previous President of Lithuania Dalia Grybauskaitė[62] is one of many surnames of Polish origin in

[60] With the biggest Jewish community in Lithuania as well!
[61] Lithuanian President established by the coup in 1926 that led authoritarian regime;
[62] Polish version: Grzybowska

Lithuania[63] and reflects "the complicated history of the Polish-Lithuanian relations" (Walkowiak 2016: 305).

At the end of the 19th century, in the beginning of the Lithuanian national upheaval, after 400 hundred years of shared history and another century of further Polonisation and Russification, the territory of Lithuania could be described as a place of high ethnic-cum-linguistic complexity (Walkowiak 2016). While Polish was predominantly spoken by intelligentsia and upper class and the Lithuanian seen as a language of peasants, this ethno-linguistic stratification, Walkowiak argues, was not as clear and could be better understood along the lines of elective ethnicity: some activists of the Lithuanian national revival spoke and corresponded in Polish, there were "Lithuanians" who spoke no Lithuanian, and there were "Poles" who spoke only Lithuanian (Liulevičius in Walkowiak 2016: 303). Moreover, lines of ethnic and national division often collided within families (Walkowiak 2016: 303). Importantly, more than in any other public domains, those ethno-nationalist frontiers were negotiated, established and challenged in personal names and, especially, in surnames. While in the early stages of nationalist campaign, prominent nationalist figures initiated the process of Lithuanization of their names[64]; during the interwar period, this process became an important part of the national agenda[65].

One of the most widely spread convictions about the formation of Lithuanian personal names is that, originally Lithuanian, many of Lithuanian names and surnames had been Polonised by such religious and bureaucratic bodies as priests and registrars: "The use of this foreign language [i.e. Polish] in official establishments resulted in the distortion of Lithuanian personal names and toponyms. The formation of surnames was being finalized in the 18th c. They were recorded in documents mostly without Lithuanian endings, Lithuanian sounds were replaced with Polish ones, foreign suffixes were affixed to them and the surname was often simply translated into Polish (Zinkevičius in Walkowiak 2016: 307).

[63] There are also many numerous surnames of Lithuanian origin still in use in Poland (Walkowiak 2016: 305).
[64] "Jonas Basanavičius, the publisher of the first Lithuanian national newspaper Aušra ('Dawn'). He was born in 1851 as Jan Basanowicz and still used his Polish name in the early 1880s" (Kamusella in Walkowiak 2016: 306);
[65] Scholars of Lithuanian anthroponymy observe an increased popularity of the old ethnic names - usually referring to the grand dukes of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania - during the times of significant national upheavals, such as the end of the 19th century, the beginning of 20th century as well as during the period of the restoration of Independence in 1990 (Ramonienė 2007: 425).

Walkowiak also describes another prevailing contemporary conviction in relation to strategies of belonging and ethnic naturalisation - that Polish/Slavic minority, living in Vilnius region, are, in fact, composed of ethnic Lithuanians "who had been forcibly Polonised in the past"[66] (Walkowiak 2016: 308). However, her research into surname-spelling conflicts between the Lithuanian state and its Polish speaking minority reveals that processes of the Lithuanian national revival also included cases of Lithuanisation of the surnames of Poles: together with the 1920 law came the practice of rewriting non-Lithuanian given names and surnames by adding a Lithuanian ending next to the unchanged root and, during subsequent years, cases of literal translation of the surname occured[67] (Walkowiak 2016: 318).

Importantly for this thesis, Walkowiak quotes national newspapers of interwar Lithuania, declaring that Slavic suffixes[68] that had been added to Lithuanian surnames from the 17th century onwards "create the wrong impression [...] that in Lithuania there are no Lithuanians" (Walkowiak 2016: 320). Moreover, it was argued that getting rid of the Slavic relic - the Slavic suffix - must be a national endeavour that aims to fight against the decay of the Lithuanian society and to restore "the original shape of the Lithuanian Nation" (Walkowiak 2016: 320). In fact, since 2009, it is legally possible for the citizens of Lithuania to *lituanize* their long surnames by getting rid of long, mostly Slavic, suffixes[69]. These practices of symbolic restoration of genealogies (or linguistic eugenics) illustrates how Lithuanian identity has been constructed within an ethno-cultural, rather than political, paradigm that understands identity as an ever-present blood-and-soil phenomenon, where such notions as nationality and ethnicity are used interchangeably (Donskis 2002: 29).

During subsequent years active steps were taken in order to restore the Lithuanian surnames to their "original shape": a committee comprised of respectable Lithuanian academics reviewed lists of surnames from all over Lithuania, aiming to Lithuanize surnames that either had Slavic suffixes, had been translated into foreign languages or had been otherwise

[66] For more on the construction of Polish ethnicity in contemporary Lithuania see Daukšas 2007.
[67] Walkowiak gives an example of a 'peasant' who recalls his grandfather being called *Zając*, his father - *Zając-Kiszkis*, and himself only *Kiszkis* (Walkowiak 2016: 319).
[68] Such as: -*ausk*[as], -*ausk*[is], -*ick*[as], -*ick*[is] (Walkowiak 2016: 320).
[69] Savickienė, Daiva. "Pavardžių trumpinimas - ne visiems." *Panevėžio balsas,* 3 Oct. 2009, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/pavardziu-trumpinimas-ne-visiems.d?id=24353889 [accessed 7 May 2019]

distorted (Walkowiak 2016: 322). This work was supposed to contribute to the forthcoming dictionaries of Lithuanian surnames, an important agent in issuing new passports that, according to the Passport Law of 1939, required that "given names and surnames in passports were Lithuanized" (Walkowiak 2016: 322). Consequently, upon the return of the Vilnius region to Lithuania in 1939, around 20 percent of inhabitants of the region received Lithuanized passports (Walkowiak 2016: 323). While this process was interrupted by the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1940, the memoirs of Lithuanian Poles reveal that the "Polish" letter *w* as well as Slavic suffixes were seen as sites of struggle in determining one's ethnic identity (Walkowiak 2016: 323). Furthermore, the bilingualism in Lithuania under Soviet rule meant that identity documents were issued in Russian (Cyrillic-script) and Lithuanian, which meant that Lithuanian Poles would rarely see their personal names written in their preferred form: "a Polish minority member by the Polish name of Maciej Szczepański would in documents be recorded as Матвей Щепанский in Russian and Matvejus Ščepanskis in Lithuanian" (Walkowiak 2016: 324).

The second wave of Lithuanization of Polish surnames took place in the early 1990s. Following the establishment of Lithuanian as a state language, regulations followed which sent unambiguous messages about the fact that, in post-Soviet Lithuania, "language is central to determining inclusion" (Clark 2006: 181). Consequently, while receiving the Lithuanian passports, a considerable amount of Lithuanian Poles[70] also had their surnames Lithuanized - sometimes without their consent, sometimes encouraged by clerks" (Walkowiak 2016: 325). Following the pre-war traditions, names and surnames in passports of Lithuanian citizens had to be written using existing Lithuanian spelling and letters (Walkowiak 2016: 325). While the use of non-Lithuanian suffixes was allowed, there was still no place for the Polish letters on the passport of the Lithuanian citizen. Not surprisingly, a case was brought to the European Court of Human Rights in 2001 by a Lithuanian citizen Tadeusz Kleckowski (Klečkovski), who had been fighting for the right to use the original/prefered version of his surname since 1989 (Walkowiak 2016: 327). He died in 2003, before hearing any verdict. Despite a long history of diplomatic interactions, the rule regarding the Polish letters remains unchanged in current Lithuania, affecting various groups of Lithuanian citizens, such as Lithuanian women who marry non-Lithuanians whose

[70] And other ethnic minorities;

surnames contain "foreign" Latin letters. For example, a Lithuanian woman who married a Belgian citizen with a surname Pauwel, had her new surname written in her marriage certificate as *Pauvels*[71] (Walkowiak 2016: 339). As Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys sum up, "[the] fear of foreign characters has converted into a battle targeting the right of citizens to original forms of their names [thus] neglecting the diversity of the public - the community - needs that exist alongside the private and the official sphere" (2018: 204). Or to use Yuval-Davis, by denying their right to original forms of their names, certain groups of Lithuanian citizens are symbolically "denied full membership in the community" (Yuval Davis 1997) and are being exposed to practices of symbolic violence (Bourdieu 1991).

As this brief overview demonstrates, contemporary Lithuanian family names can be understood as cultural sites where a long and complicated history between Lithuanians and Poles is reflected and challenged until this day. Starting from the late 19th century, within the Lithuanian nationalist discourse, Lithuanian surnames are seen as ultimate indicators of a "pure" shape of a Lithuanian identity. In addition, the absence or presence of a certain suffix within one's family name can be seen as - what I would call - a symbolic frontier that acts as a tool of categorization, discrimination or inclusion. As this thesis aims to demonstrate, while certain suffixes are seen as artifacts of an unwanted historical heritage, others - like the ones found within traditional Lithuanian female surnames - are perceived as a fundamental segment of the "archaic" Lithuanian language and, thus, are discursively constructed as an untouchable part of Lithuanian national identity.

Yuval-Davis has distinguished three major, but not mutually exclusive, strategies of nation-building: through genealogy, cultural imagination and citizenship (1997). Based on an historicized approach to Lithuanian language and gender ideologies and their intersection with Polish cultural and linguistic heritage, I would argue that as an essential part of the nationalist narrative of ethno-linguistic imagination, the Lithuanian surname serves as 1) a symbolic strategy that 2) establishes a sense of common origin and solid genealogies and 3) also functions as a tool of bureaucratic categorization and symbolic violence in processes of establishing ethno-nationalist citizenships. Consequently, I would argue that, in the case of

[71] In 2015, a court in Vilnius passed a verdict in favour of her request to write her surname in its original form, arguing for the respect for an individual's private and family life over the right of the state to protect its cultural identity (Walkowiak 2016: 339).

Lithuania, surnames, rather than a tool of categorization, are an analytical category that can be seen as a conjunctive phenomenon at all three levels of gendered paradigms of nation-building.

On the development of nationalist family ideology

In the early years of Lithuanian national awakening, besides language related ideological concerns, the Lithuanian intelligentsia was highly preoccupied with the question of Lithuanian women and their role in the nationalist movement (Balkelis 2009: 69). However, differently from their Russian contemporaries, the Lithuanian male elite was not preoccupied with issues of social emancipation (Balkelis 2009: 69) - in their pursuit of modern society based on Lithuanian national identity, they rejected the values of the traditional family of their rural background (Leinartė 2006) and sought "new and radical models of marriage making" (Balkelis 2009: 73). In their aim to produce the next nationally conscious generation, their main preoccupation was in finding an educated and nationally conscious wife - a challenging task to achieve at the turn of 20th century Lithuania (Leinartė 2006: 84).

Yuval-Davis has argued that women play an important role in processes of cultural imagination of the nation as they are constructed as symbolic bearers of collective identities; language and tradition are seen as major categories that construct the myth of national cultural imagination (Yuval-Davis 1997). Discourses surrounding "the women's question" within private as well as public discussions of Lithuanian-speaking intelligentsia at the turn of the 20th Century were also based on the premise that women are both biological and cultural producers of the nation. However, differently from their contemporaries in Germany, Italy or France, Lithuanian nationalists were not invested in pronatalistic discourse - their family ideology was constructed on the notion that "[o]nly a nationally conscious wife and children raised in the Lithuanian spirit [can be] considered to be the most solid base for a strong nation" (Leinartė 2006: 81). Their discussions over the encompassing role of the mother in determining the ethno-nationalist profile of the future generations reveal how mothers were seen as, following Yuval-Davis, the symbolic bearers of collective

identities (1997: 67). And their role in producing and re-producing the nation both linguistically and culturally within the private family domain was seen to be as important as their ethnicity (Leinartė 2006; Balkelis 2009). What was, however, new in these ideological constructions of the nationalistically preoccupied family is that the Lithuanian male intelligentsia was imagining a nationally conscious wife as an equally invested companion that would provide some sort of reconciliation of private and public lives and would share the same patriotic goals (Leinartė 2006: 84)[72].

Historical investigations into the debates of the nationalist elite reveal how categories of an ideal wife and an ideal mother intersect with each other, constructing a notion of symbolic patriotic motherhood as both a biological and cultural realm. And so it is within these decades-long public discussions of male intelligentsia that the cult of motherhood was crystalized, in which the Lithuanian peasant woman serves as "both chief guardian and repository of national spirit and ethnic tradition" (Marcinkevičienė in Balkelis 2009: 78). As one of the most significant strategies of social and cultural movement, Lithuanian nationalist family ideology established the family as a primary national institution and assigned women a task of symbolic bearers of the nation, thus inflating the social importance of the private domain. As Balkelis concludes, "the social respectability of women was to be achieved through the process of their domestication, not through participation in public politics" (2009: 78).

[72] Remarkably, their *ideal of a perfect wife* was dramatically incompatible with the social reality of the time: "few could find such a woman among the Lithuanian peasants. Despite the fact that the mother tongue of peasant girls was Lithuanian, and they preserved Lithuanian traditions [...], these young women still were uneducated. [...] In contrast, Lithuanian noblewomen and gentry women were incomparably better educated. However, their everyday language was Polish" (Leinartė 2006: 84). Therefore, while some pressed for women's education (Balkelis 2009: 72), at the practical level, the male intelligentsia were left to choose between an educated gentry (half-Polish) woman or an ethnic Lithuanian peasant girl (Leinartė 2006: 84); a dilemma that left some of the most prominent figures of the Lithuanian elite choosing a third way - that, of a bachelorhood: "I am engaged to Lithuania, and hence do not abandon my fiancée" (Kudirka in Leinartė 2006: 89).

The Lithuanian language is undoubtedly one of the main tenets in the cultural repository that the patriotic mother is seen as holding access to. A sculpture by Petras Rimša (1881-1961) titled *Lithuanian School* that depicts a peasant mother who - while working her spinning wheel - reads a Lithuanian textbook together with her child, is one of the most popular cultural symbols of Lithuanian nationalism until today (Balkelis 2009: 78). Presented at the first exhibition of Lithuanian Art Society in Vilnius in 1906, it soon became an iconic image of Lithuanian cultural resilience and the role of the Lithuanian woman "as a 'nation-mother' responsible for cultural reproduction" (Balkelis 2009: 79). An iconic image of Lithuanian resistance that, even now, captures and embodies the national narrative of Lithuanian motherhood.

Fig. 1. Petras Rimša. Lithuanian School 1864-1904. Photograph courtesy of the Lithuanian Art Centre TARTLE, Vilnius, Lithuania.

Lithuanian literary scholars have argued that post-Soviet prose fiction "does not lack the energy to articulate the past decade's collision with the Western world" (Kelertas in Kačkutė 2015: 84). In her analysis of a text that represents a growing body of contemporary exile literatures written by Lithuanian women, Eglė Kačkutė looks at experiences of multilingual motherhood - or silent mothers[73] - and depictions of trauma that is caused by the inability to connect with their children through their native tongue (2015). Referring to the above mentioned sculpture of a mother at the spinning wheel, Kačkutė hypothesized that "[f]or the silent mother, then, to leave her native language and swap it for a foreign one would be a suicidal act of betrayal of not only her own role as a Lithuanian mother, but of the entire nation" (Kačkutė 2015: 89). She refers to the internalized awareness of the Lithuanian women of the burden of representation (Yuval-Davis 1997) assigned to them within the national myth of language/nation preservation and the petrifying fear of "the power of the collective punitive imagination of one traumatized nation" (Kačkutė 2015: 89). A fear that, ultimately, keeps them silent and, eventually, vanishing from both native and foreign domains. A graphic impersonation of the national metaphor of mother/nation by the speaker of Staponkutė's text reveals that self-awareness: "As I observe the *agonia* (the battle of the death) of my native language on my children's lips, I behold the image of my own vanishing" (Staponkutė in Kačkutė 2015: 89).

Language policy under the Soviets

According to Lithuanian scholars studying Lithuanian prescriptivism[74], the language policy in Lithuania *today* is unique not only in relation to other post-Soviet countries, but in the Western context in general, as "[d]uring the post-1990 period the Lithuanian LP[75] turned into a self-reproductive and completely bureaucratic phenomenon" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 204). They hypothesize that Lithuanian mythologized ethno-linguistic identity was encouraged and commodified by the Soviets in order to control the public space through language surveillance and, thus, to ensure "socialist content in national form" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 198; Baločkaitė 2014). While after the annexation the

[73] Following a text by a Lithuanian author in exile Dalia Staponkutė titled *Motinų tylėjimas* [The Silence of the Mothers], published in 2003;
[74] For more, see Raila and Subačius 2012; Šepetys 2012; Tamaševičius 2012; Vaicekauskienė 2011)
[75] Abb. Language Planning and Language Policy

Russian language was introduced as the official administrative language and intensive teaching started in schools, Lithuanian was still used in all domains. Consequently, as an important tool of Sovietization, written and public language had to be supervised regarding ideological matters - a work that was allocated to language editors who, besides grammar, pronunciation and accentuation, had to supervise and correct the ideological content (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 198). The sentiments expressed by some of the most prominent linguists of Soviet Lithuania portray the work of editors as "the daily work of language sanitation" - a discourse that is highly compatible with the Soviet value system that presumed "that people are inclined to negative influences, and hence needed to be educated" (Vaicekauskienė in Tamaševičius 2016: 246). This work created an unwritten contract between the Soviet authorities and the linguists (Daugirdas in Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 210), some of who regularly express regrets regarding their reduced authority: "[o]nly nostalgic memories are left from that *then* Soviet time when the language specialists regularly broadcast on language on TV and radio, [they] had a deep and true authority in the society and made a clear educational impact" (Miliūnaitė in Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 210). While the language politics of the 1950s focused on illiteracy as one of the major strategies in constructing - both materially and discursively - the socialist working class, later Soviet years saw a more subtle "mode of governance" (Baločkaitė 2014: 47). As *kul'turnost* became a new moral directive, both written and spoken language was used as means of self-surveillance, shaming and social pressure (Baločkaitė 2014: 47).

A special note must be made on the Soviet maternalist policies which, while incoherent and differing from one socialist state to another, aimed to dismantle the monopoly of bourgeois family as a domain inappropriate for "the formation of the communist citizen" (Issoupova 2000; see also Jūrėnienė 2016). Acknowledging the primal role of the mother in educating future citizens, the Soviet state tried to shift the perception of child-rearing from the private to the public domain by establishing strong institutional and ideological bonds with mothers through the celebrative discourse of motherhood as the highest service to the state, an introduction of paternalistic discourse of the state as sole protector of mothers and infants in the form of medical care and state-funded nurseries, *and* by symbolically excluding the fathers from the state-mother-child triangle (Issoupova 2000). According to the research carried out by Virginija Jūrėnienė on the role of the family in the practices of anti-Soviet

resistance in Lithuania, the Soviet state has succeeded in convincing its citizens of its genuine investments into the wellbeing of the family as the primary pillar of the Soviet society - "[m]ost of the respondents said that the government took care of the family and the education of children" (2016: 288-289). In line with Donskis who has described that Roman Catholic Lithuanian identity as "an essentially defensive phenomenon of [national] consciousness" (2002: 25), Jūrėnienė observes that certain spiritual or religious practices (like going to church, holding a religious marriage ceremony, celebrating national *and* religious festivals) were described by the respondents as forms of *passive* nationalist resistance (2016). However, while studies of the history of Lithuania as extracurricular family activity has been described as one of the forms of passive resistance (Jūrėnienė 2016), the Lithuanian language is not described as an endangered domain. One could argue that, during the period of Soviet occupation, the symbolic burden of the mother as the primary gatekeeper of the Lithuanian ethno-linguistic identity has been entrusted to "the whole army" (Vanagas 1990) of professional linguists who served as institutionalized authority facilitating the widespread fear of Russification and nationalist investments of language preservation *as well as* agents of linguistics and ideological language unification, which, besides other things, aimed to eliminate signs of social stratification (Liebich in Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 198).

During the Soviet period, then, the idea of a homogenous form of the Lithuanian language that is designed and then administered in a form of what later turned into the "language police" had been established, causing unusual opposition between the norm setters and language users[76] (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 199). More importantly, this period affected the developing field of linguists devoted primarily to the investigations of language use and codification of standard norms by enhancing their importance in protecting and preserving the language as, primarily, a moral/ideological category and allocating to them the role of sole authorities who "have access to the mysteries of [Lithuanian] language" (Tamaševičius 2016).

[76] Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys (2018) underline that a particularly derogatory and patronizing discourse produced by the agents of Language Planning policies presumes that language users from all social domains are unable to to use the Lithuanian language 'properly' and, thus, in need of constant surveillance and corrections.

Language policy in post-totalitarian time

According to Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys, the legal bureaucratic scheme that was gradually established after the restoration of independence in the 1990 was founded and sustained by the affective (Massumi 2015) discourse of emergency produced by language planners. During the last years of the Soviet period (1988-1990), leading linguists called for "immediate treatment of a chronic, festering wound" - the Lithuanian language - that has been brought to the critical condition due to the influence of russification and bilingualism during the Soviet period (Tamaševičius 2016: 247). However, from a language maintenance perspective, "there was no serious reason for concern" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepety 2018: 200). From an ethnic composition perspective, Lithuania has the most homogenous population among the three Baltic states, with 84.2 percent of Lithuanians, 6.6 percent Polish and 5.8 percent Russian as of 2011[77] (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 200). Nevertheless, echoing the Neo-Romantic sentiments of the end of the nineteenth century, language elites maintained that "the language was suffering from a terminal disease" and encouraged to "form a national opinion that it is a shameful crime of its citizens to tolerate their mother tongue's mutilation[78]" (Vanagas in Tamaševičius 2016: 247). However, this time around, besides protesting against the historically determined legacy of Russification, they were alerting the Lithuanian nation to the no lesser dangers of "the spread of the English language" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepety 2018: 208). This declaration of emergency, however, was not based on any empirical knowledge, but rather was a "purely ideological" discourse, which, by declaring the threat of extinction to the language (and, thus, to the whole nation), aimed to strengthen and maintain an institutional power and "to expand language monitoring" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepety 2018: 212; see also Tamaševičius 2016: 248). Notably, besides a few sporadic discussions within small circles of intellectual elite, this phenomenon of language nationalisation possesses a wide public support until today: "Lithuanian language, the mother tongue we all have had as ours, now is nationalized and turned into property of the state [to the point that] you may even get punished for a language

[77] "According to Latvian and Estonian censuses from 2000, the relative percentage of titular population and Russian minority in Latvia was, respectively, 60/30 percent, in Estonia 68/62 percent" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 200)

[78] Interestingly, the metaphor of language mutilation, as it will be demonstrated in Part IV, is repeated often in relation to the new surname by the critics of the non-suffixed surname.

error [...] Yet the society supports and even encourages the authorities..." (Sverdiokas in Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 208).

The work of Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys suggests that contemporary language policy in Lithuania is "rooted in the soviet regulative practices" (2018: 213). They argue that artificial protection of one of the most archaic Indo-European languages was strategically useful for the Soviets as, by encouraging language normalization, they could also regulate speakers' behaviour. Consequently, built around isolationist and defensive discourse, current language ideology "problematizes language variation" (2018: 210). Most interestingly, they argue that, remarkably, "the post-Soviet nostalgia for 'ideal language' essentially differs from the universal cultural longing of the lost time when language supposedly existed in an unblemished state which is said to characterize standard language community" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 209). What they seem to be suggesting is that, while Lithuanian nationalist ideology is built around the call for vigilant protection of the old, unique and vulnerable Indo-European language, the corpus of this archaic language has been determined and remains monopolized by a group of selected linguists (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 209), leaving the rest of the language community in a position where they need to apologize for not knowing their mother-tongue well enough (Tamaševičius 2016).

What, in early post-Soviet years, started as a call to make sure that citizens of other ethnic origin speak [good] Lithuanian in their professional setting[79], now functions as a demand from any Lithuanian citizen to use the "correct" version of Lithuanian (Subačius in Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 201). Issued in 1995, The Law of State language[80] "provided an ideal matrix, according to which all supervision of *official* and *public* language affairs [...] had to be implemented" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 204). It defines in which public mediums the state language [is required] and, besides various official state proceedings, "internal document and correspondence of enterprise and business, as well as public information, public signs and advertisements are included" (Vaicekauskienė and

[79] "One must note that introduction of Lithuanian language instruction for speakers of other mother tongues than Lithuanian was far from unproblematic. Tens of thousands of people were forced to go through language courses followed up by offensive and discriminatory public discourse and controlled by a wide network of 'language police'" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 201).
[80] *Valstybinės kalbos įstatymas*

Šepetys 2018: 201). The mass media, including private media institutions and publishers, for example, is scrupulously monitored by The State Language Inspectorate[81], while The State Commission of Lithuanian Language (SCLL) "has been fully authorized to approve compulsory norms of correct language and to lay down language regulations" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 205), including "The list of Major Language Errors" that consists of hundreds of grammatical and lexical mistakes (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 205). As the only Soviet bureaucratic body that has been transferred with no major adjustments[82], this language surveillance apparatus has produced a powerful discourse that the Lithuanian language users are not able to speak their mother tongue. From the President of Lithuania to people in mundane life situations, participants of the Lithuanian language community produce an apologetic self-censorship or, in many cases, self-silencing when facing an authoritative audience of the linguists: "'My language is bad' - apologizes the President when meeting the linguists"[83]. Inevitably, this language regime is affecting the whole language community, especially the school children who are increasingly reporting their fear over not being able to speak and write proper Lithuanian[84]. A disturbing sign of the development of what Turbin has called pathological logophobia which describes a fear of words and of speaking in general within formalized structures of everyday life (in Baločkaitė 2012: 49).

The State Commission of Lithuanian Language (SCLL) also plays a major role in all the discussions related to the questions of Lithuanian names and surnames. Interestingly, more than once, respondents of my study - as well as women interviewed regarding their surname choices in the Lithuanian media - refer to the authoritative status of the linguists in making certain self-naming options acceptable for the language users[85]:

---

[81] *Valstybinė kalbos inspekcija*

[82] Vaicekauskienė, Loreta. "Kalba keičiasi, kalbos kontrolieriai - ne." *Delfi.lt,* 1 July 2013, www.delfi.lt/news/ringas/lit/l-vaicekauskiene-kalba-keiciasi-kalbos-kontrolieriai-ne.d?id=61752747

[83] "Apie kalbos raidą ir jos vaizdinius: kokia oficialioji lietuvių kalbos ideologija?" *Naujasis Židinys-Aidai,* 24 Feb. 2011, www.lrytas.lt/kultura/istorija/2011/02/24/news/apie-kalbos-raida-ir-jos-vaizdinius-kokia-oficialioji-lietuviu-kalbos-ideologija--5580614/

[84] Vaicekauskienė, Loreta. "Kaip mūsų vaikus padaro neraštingais - žvilgsnis iš šalies." *15min.lt,* 22 Nov. 2018, www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/komentarai/loreta-vaicekauskiene-kaip-musu-vaikus-padaro-nerastingais-zvilgsnis-is-salies-500-1062602

[85] As it will be discussed in Part IV, particularly *affective* narratives against the language norm-setters are produced by Lithuanian women who would prefer to have a surname *identical* to that of their husband - that is, with an ending identifying grammatical male gender.

> I really did not want to have the long [suffixed] surname so I chose the one approved by the linguists [e12]

In the most recent episode that stirred wide public debate, a man with a surname Gervė[86] who is willing to change his surname presented to the State Commission of Lithuanian Language a list of 31 potential surnames constructed by adding different suffixes to the core of his current surname (*Gerv-*). Literally translating to a common name of a (bird) crane, his surname is one of a few Lithuanian male surnames that - while denoting male gender - contain an *-ė* ending. In fact, the presence of these surnames within Lithuanian linguistic community was one of the arguments against the introduction of the non-suffixed feminine surnames put forward by the critics of this new linguistic legislation (Miliūnaitė 2013). Paradoxically, as one the reasons Mr Gervė presented in relation to his application for a new surname is that the ending of his current family name - after the introduction of the non-suffixed feminine surnames - now connotes grammatical feminine gender. In an attempt to correct what Pilcher would call contradictory embodiment (2016), he submitted a list of surnames he would agree to be called by. His list included versions like Gervaitis, Gervilius, Gervis, Gervelis with his favorite being Gervilaitis.

His application for a change of a surname was rejected. Four times. He explains having been told that his surname "*is beautiful* and the change would harm the linguistic heritage and would potentially distort the Lithuanian language"[87]. He was also told that, while it is a common practice to change family names by getting rid of (mostly Slavic) suffixes, adding new suffixes to the already existing - unique - surname is not possible as it would create a new, non existing form of a family name. He was encouraged to use the most acceptable practice and change his surname into the one of his wife or his relatives, but he insists on finding a form of a surname that would maintain a semantic connection to his current

[86] Other surnames: *Stokė, Lapė, Ropė...*
[87] Gritėnas, Paulius. "Pavardę pasikeisti norintis vyras VLKK pasiūlė 31 variantą - netiko nė vienas." *15min.lt*, 15 Jan. 2019, https://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/lietuva/pavarde-pasikeisti-norintis-vyras-vlkk-pasiule-31-varianta-netiko-ne-vienas-56-1085816 [accessed 9th April 2019]

surname[88]. This incident epitomizes the whole century of discussions related to the question of traditional Lithuanian female surnames. His individual experience of living with this beautiful Lithuanian surname is not seen as a convincing reason to provide him with a possibility to change his family name. As many linguists have also argued against non-suffixed female surnames - people's complexes is not a linguistic problem (Miliūnaitė 2013). However, if he had a Slavic surname, he would be allowed to get rid of intrusive suffixes and make it more Lithuanian. This example demonstrates that owners of truly Lithuanian surnames are also expected to carry a burden of representation (Yuval-Davis 1997) by embodying ethno-linguistic identities. Traditional suffixes found within Lithuanian female surnames, as I argue below, are also classified as protected linguistic heritage of the archaic Lithuanian language, but, differently from male family names, are also associated with a certain type of femininity (Cameron 2003). In what follows, I provide a historical overview of the development of Lithuanian female surnames and engage with a few episodes of historical discussions in my aim to inquire into which and how different political agendas have influenced discussions that were promoting a Lithuanian female surname reform.

Non-suffixed female surnames

Lithuanians have had a binomial system of personal naming for over 500 years (Ramonienė 2007: 424). According to Lithuanian historians and scholars of onomastics (for more see Maciejauskienė 1991; Ragauskaitė 2005; Zinkevičius 1977), the binary naming tradition which set the ground for contemporary naming practices appeared in administrative and church archives in the 15th century as an outcome of the introduction of Christianity. Lithuania was the last country in Europe to embrace Christianity (in the 14th century) with certain ethnographic areas adopting it as late as in 1413 (the lowlanders - the inhabitants of the north-western territories) (Ramonienė 2007: 424). Consequently, similarly to other European countries where the second name - usually related to one's nicknames, affiliations or occupation - would follow a Christian name received during baptism (Wilson 1998), the

[88] One could argue that this determination to stick to the 'surname of one's own instead of following a naming practice common to so many women indicates how much 'the male patrilineal privilege' (Rom and Benjamin 2011) is internalized by the male members of Lithuanian language community.

first Lithuanian binary names were constructed by replacing Lithuanian ethnic names with Christian names: "it became customary to add another name to the one commonly used. Christian names were written first and thus replaced the first Lithuanian ethnic names; and the position of the second names was taken by names of various origin, for example *Petras Normantas* (the second name is an old composite name), *Jurgis Buidydaitis* (old composite name with patronymic suffix), *Jonas Mažutis* (from *mažas* "small")" (Ramonienė 2007: 424).

Lithuanian scholars of onomastics offer a rather assertive interpretation regarding the development of the linguistic tradition in which women's surnames possess feminising suffixes that traditionally indicate their marital status. In the earliest historical documents, (single) names of women already had different endings (e.g. *Daugirdas* and *Daugirda*, *Daugirdė*) (Zinkevičius in Žemienė 2018: 181). Suffixed female surnames, it has been suggested, appear in Lithuanian language around the 15th century, thus starting a long lasting language tradition (Garšva 2012). Throughout the 16th-18th centuries, Lithuanian female surnames took final shape as derivatives from men's surname adding a list of suffixes for *girls*: *-aitė, -ytė, -(i)ūtė* (in some dialects: *-aičia, -yčia, -(i)ūčia, -ikė, -(i)ukė, -ėlė, -okė*). Surnames of married women were constructed from the surname of their husband adding a Lithuanian suffix *-ienė* (*Stripienė, Grigienė, Kairienė*) (Garšva 2012: 217-218). However, according to Vitalija Maciejauskienė, wider studies into the development of Lithuanian female naming practices are only possible from the 16th century onwards when personal names of women start appearing in official documents (Maciejauskienė in Žemienė 2018: 182). Until then, only surnames of noble women, widows, or rich landowners would periodically appear in official documents (Garšva 2012).

Importantly, the most intensive period of Lithuanian surname formation coincides with the process of Slavonification:

> "[only used as a spoken medium], [t]he Lithuanian language was not used as the written medium in the Lithuanian state of the 13th and 14th centuries. [...] Latin was used in Lithuania not only as the language of the Church or science but also as the language of state governments. [...] Old Slavonic was used for internal written communication of the state from the 13th to the 15th centuries. [...] In 1697 the Polish language became the official language of the state office, and written texts of the 17th and

> 18th centuries were mostly in Polish. In such historical circumstances, the official texts that serve as the main source of Lithuanian anthroponymics, were written in languages other than Lithuanan" (Ramonienė 2007: 427-428).

In fact, Maciejauskienė has demonstrated that when larger numbers of personal names of women start to appear in official registry documents of the 16th century, they follow a tradition of suffixed female surnames, but those suffixes are predominantly of Slavonic origin: "the most common suffixes when constructing female surnames from patronyms *-ovna, -evna* and *-ova, -eva* - when using anthroponyms of the husband"[89] [90] (in Žemienė 2018: 182). This tendency dominates official documents during the final stages of Lithuanian surname formation with the vast majority of female second names being recorded with slavonic suffixes (Ramonienė 2007). However, baptismal records show a high number of female names that contain a Lithuanian suffix, often - in their vernacular forms of *-aičia, -yčia, -(i)ūčia,* (Maciejauskienė in Žemienė 2018: 182).

Parish priests and other Polish-speaking officials are described as the main agents of the Slavonification of Lithuanian female surnames: "knowing the surname of the husband, there was no need to ask for the surname of a woman, so married women were recorded under husband's surname *-ova* (unmarried - with *-ovna*)" (Garšva 2012: 218). Interestingly, within the Lithuanian vernacular forms of male surnames, there also existed (and are still used in a form of a nickname) surnames of young unmarried men with a suffix *-ok-*: *"Breivokas, Raišeliokas, Viksviokas"* (Maciejauskienė 2001: 177). However, these forms were not recorded within state documents and have not been institutionalised within the official naming system. Therefore, I find unconvincing the statement of Meilutė Ramonienė, who argues that "[t]he process of surname formation in Lithuania [...] was quite natural as the surnames were formed on the basis of the naturally and developing system of personal names, where the anthroponyms written alongside the given names were passed from generation to generation" (2007: 427). While it is true that, differently from Latvia, there had been no state interventions in terms of regulating the process of surname formation

[89] Here and elsewhere - my own translation.

[90] A tradition to construct women's surnames with the suffix *-ova* is still applied in contemporary Slavonic languages, such as Czech, Slovak (mostly compulsory), Polish (optional) and Slovenian (used informally) (Nowakowska 2016)

(Ramonienė 2007: 427), there is little proof that the suffixes found in Lithuanian female surnames is "an exceptional linguistic phenomenon" (Garšva 2012). As has been argued, they follow a tradition of feminising female suffixes widely used in other - mostly Slavonic - linguistic cultures (i.e. Polish, Czech, Slovakian languages), some of which have already abandoned suffixes that would traditionally demonstrate woman's marital status[91]. Therefore, even though they differ morphologically, they follow an ideological pattern that inscribes the relational nature of women's lives (Maclean in Eichner 2014) common to other Slavonic languages and are highly comparable with Polish naming practices used interchangeably with that of Lithuanian for a few hundreds of years. In fact, some Lithuanian scholars and language practitioners have challenged the position of the Lithuanian female surname as an exceptional and ancient cultural heritage arguing that Latvians had abandoned a marital ending *-ienė* a hundred years ago, straight after the First World War, by introducing a non-suffixed female surnames usually ending with *-a* (e.g. Berzins (*m*) and Berzina)[92].

The narrative of untouchable national heritage dominated the discursive field during the discussions related to the introduction of non-suffixed female surnames. During the first years of independence, in the early 1990s, occasional texts within the Lithuanian media occured that encouraged a reform of the traditional family name system by getting rid of traditional suffixes that demonstrate woman's dependence on a man (be it the father or a husband) (Miliūnaitė 2013: 72). Linguists within the media advocated protecting linguistic traditions that took hundreds of years to establish, and called unwise the desire to give up what is so distinctive and unique (Miliūnaitė 2013: 73). However, in 1999, the question of discriminator traditional female surnames started to be discussed at an institutional level when Lithuanian historian Danutė Vailionytė-Narkevičienė filed a complaint to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania demanding a right to call herself Danutė Vailionė. In her complaint, she argued that the traditional family name system discriminates against women as it reveals information about their marital status (in Miliūnaitė 2013: 75). Interestingly, she also contested the exceptionality of traditional Lithuanian surnames arguing that what is considered as a uniquely Lithuanian heritage is actually an outcome of

[91] In Poland, for example, *maiden* suffixes *-owna* are only used by a few as an aesthetic of "snobbish" way of self-naming (Nowakowska 2016).
[92] Axel Holvoet in Kiliukienė, Jūratė. "Moterų pavardžių 'revoliucija' nuo kaimynų atsilieka šimtmečiu." *Respublika,* Aug. 21, 2003, p. 18.

Polonization[93]. While Lithuanian linguists hold divergent views on this question, it is important to notice how (what is perceived as) feminist discourse[94] is fused with the nationalist language ideology in constructing a narrative that the non-suffixed surname represents a more archaic - therefore, more Lithuanian - notion of ethnic femininity. Consequently, nationalist ethno-linguistic discourse here is used as a discursive strategy in promoting 'feminist' agenda. Nevertheless, the members of The State Commission of Lithuanian Language were not convinced that traditional suffixes cause discrimination against women. They argued that historical sources demonstrate that the use of female suffixes dates as far as the 16th century and so they can be considered a part of Lithuanian historical and cultural heritage. In short, as the former head of the Language Commission put it - "everything that is archaic must be protected" (Mikulėnienė in Miliūnaitė 2013: 76).

However, a few years later the Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson (*Moterų ir vyrų lygių galimybių kontrolieriaus tarnyba*) received another complaint from a Lithuanian woman that referred to the legal concept of indirect discrimination that was introduced from the European Union Equality directive. Based on the European equal rights law it is illegal to inquire into the marital status of potential employees; thus, traditional surnames that reveal marital - that is, private - information of women indirectly discriminates them against men (Miliūnaitė 2013: 82). Partly due to the new progressively European reframing of the surname problem and partly because of a much more liberal position of a new chairman of the Language Commission Irena Smetonienė, the new legislation was supported by suggesting an introduction of a non-suffixed female surname with an ending *-ė* to be used alongside with traditional suffixed family names. Interestingly, there had been some previous historical discussions regarding the suffix questions. While sociolinguist scholars focus mostly on the linguistic argumentations of those discussions (Miliūnaitė 2013), my interest lies in the discursive embeddedness of the discourses that have supported those discussions and whether and how they are interrupted, reversed or reproduced as they move through time and space (Bucholtz 2003).

[93] From a private interview with Dalia Gudavičiūtė, the journalist who was covering this story.
[94] Framed as feminist by the media and, as it has been observed by Rita Miliunaite (2013), by the Lithuanian language users.

The father of Lithuanian grammar - *Jonas Jablonskis* - had been mentioned more than once during the historical and contemporary discussions related to the question of Lithuanian female surnames. While Miliūnaitė argues that there is not enough historical documentation to back up this position (2013: 49), his authoritative comments to female assistants about the incongruity of male and female surnames have been extensively cited to promote the abandoning of traditional suffix use. Importantly, sporadic public discussions during the interwar period in Lithuania problematized the fact that mature, unmarried women are forced to carry a diminutive surname of a sentimental little girl. While boys are always addressed by a surname of a grown up man, women - even if they have a doctoral title - are subjected to feeling like dolls or children (in Miliūnaitė 2013: 58; see also Birmontienė and Jurėnienė 2009). Importantly, one of the authors participating in the media discussions argues that a possibility of introducing homogenous surname endings to all women was enthusiastically supported by all of the female teachers she had spoken to (in Miliūnaitė 2013: 58), thus suggesting that the surname issue was mostly relevant to a particular segment of interwar women - that of unmarried women of intelligentsia.

Another extensive discussion in relation to the traditional surname system appeared in the Lithuanian media of the 1970s in a popular women's magazine *Soviet woman* (Tarybinė moteris) (Miliūnaitė 2013). Framing the classification of women into single and married as one of the humiliating bourgeois laws that needs to be uprooted, a female author of the initiatory article was advocating for uniform endings of female surnames (Miliūnaitė 2013: 60). She argued that diminutive suffixes of traditional surnames often contain negative connotation and are not appropriate for a grown-up individual (Miliūnaitė 2013: 61). Additionally, she was underlining that unmarried men do not possess diminutive suffixes (Miliūnaitė 2013: 61). Finally, she re-framed the uniquely *Lithuanian* surname system as an outdated tradition that is also steadfastly disappearing in Poland - the only other existing culture that possesses similar categorization of women (Miliūnaitė 2013: 61). Her commentary instigated a long discussion that involved responses both from contemporary linguists and ordinary women of Soviet times Lithuania, one of which recalled had been bullied due to the fact that, while sharing the same diminutive surname with her mother, it was obvious that she was an illegitimate child (in Miliūnaitė 2013: 62). Besides common arguments regarding the exceptionality, traditionality and functionality of the family name

system, some linguistics insisted that "Soviet establishment by now has eliminated all possible social conditions under which it would be possible to categorize women as superior or inferior based on their marital status" (Miliūnaitė 2013: 62).

One can see how historical discussions regarding the inadequacy of the traditional surname system are constructed in relation to the existing hegemonic political and cultural discourses and can be read as strategic counter-narratives that speak volumes about the master narratives of the time as they come from historically situated discursive ground (Andrews et al. 2004: 1). Tomas Balkelis has argued that - for the Lithuanian intelligentsia - the family was certainly of primal importance and women were assigned a *sacred* role of bearers and symbolic mentors of the nation within the private domain (2009: 78). However, the narrative was insufficient to the patriot women "who preferred the public role [...] to quiet domestic patriotism" (Balkelis 2009: 79). Seen in this light, the interwar discussions regarding the inadequacy of traditional suffixes could be linked to interwar negotiations of the role of an educated unmarried woman within the public domain. Closely tied to a certain type of femininity (Cameron 2003) that is defined as infantile, sentimental and, thus, not appropriate to be used in relation to mature educated women, traditional diminutive suffixes of Lithuanian female surnames became unsatisfactory to intelligentsia women in interwar Lithuania as the notion of social respectability was inevitably connected to marriage - a domain where heteronormative marriage practices and ethno-linguistic nationalism intersect and work in close relationship to each other. Further historical debates, however, were framed in relation to Soviet gender ideologies.

Within the Soviet family ideology framework, an ideal Soviet woman is a wage-earning mother: "the Soviet gender system combined Soviet work ethics that required all citizens to participate in the work force and biological determinism stressing the "natural" obligations of women: caring, nurturing and giving birth" (Rotkirch in Kurvet-Käosaar 2016: 122). Consequently, in contrast to the interwar nationalist constructions of patriotic motherhood, the respectability of a woman within the Soviet gender ideology is established by participating both in private *and* public domains. And while an inquiry into the Soviet media representations of single women reveals that Soviet family ideology was not supportive of this kind of femininity (Marcinkevičienė 2009: 57), earlier described criticism towards

linguistic practices that [split] women into married and unmarried is embedded within the Soviet discourse that propagated the liberation of women from the patriarchal bourgeois family (Kurvet-Käosaar 2016).

While embedded within different and even contradictory historical discourses in relation to the politized notions of femininity, 20th century discussions of the surname issue problematized and challenged the type of femininity affiliated with the *maiden* suffixes of unmarried women. One could argue that those discussions are mostly preoccupied with the changing social role of a single woman and echo feminist dissatisfaction with assymmetric forms of address for women and men labeling women as either *Frau* or *Fraulein* and all men as *Herr* in German speaking countries (Kuhn 2007), *Mademoiselle*, *Madame* and *Monsieur* in France (Mansker 2007) or *Miss*, *Mrs* and *Mr* in English speaking communities (Wendy Atkins-Sayre 2005). However, I would argue that later public discussions and, most importantly, the self-naming narratives of contemporary women[95] who have obtained the non-suffixed surname reveal a paradigm shift as they are mostly preoccupied with postcolonial reconsiderations of feminine marital identities. So while in the first few historical episodes the *surname problem* was mostly related to the traditional suffixes *-aitė*, *-ytė*, *-utė*, the late 20th century discussions and self-naming practices are largely preoccupied with the marital suffix *-ienė*.

A petition of 2009

In 2009, six years after the introduction of the new ending *-ė*, a group of 13 social activists signed a petition to the Parliament (*Seimas*) of the Republic of Lithuania calling the decision to be repealed (Miliūnaitė 2013: 329). The text of the petition praised the Lithuanian language - the oldest living Indo-European language - for its exceptional musicality, richness as well as its unique and most perfect family name system[96]:

> It is only in our national language that men, girls and married women possess differently composed, beautifully sounding, declinable [...] surnames. Surnames of girls with diminutive suffixes organically

[95] Extensively analysed in Part IV of this thesis;
[96] Here and later - my personal translation of the petition published in Miliūnaitė 2013: 351;

> reflect the characteristics of their age as well as have a pleasant sounding. Incredibly beautiful and original are the surnames of married women with traditional suffixes -ienė [...]. They demonstrate sacred belonging to the family, symbolize fidelity and close relationships between spouses. Only women who lead immoral and dishonest life are degraded when being addressed by the surname that does not contain those suffixes[97].

This petition, signed by a group of respectable linguists, poets and other members of nationalist elite, is built on the Neo-Romantic sentiments and the myth of the antiquity of the Lithuanian language (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 196). The traditional family name system is constructed as an untouchable and unique treasure that enriches the oldest living Indo-European language. Consequently, the new surname are compared by some guardians of the language as an invasive weed[98]. The authors of this petition suggested that if women were *so* willing to hide that they are married, they could simply do this in a civilized and acceptable way - by keeping their original surname (with diminutive suffix) upon marriage.

In line with the Lithuanian language ideology, an introduction of the new linguistic legislation is perceived as a metaphorical mutilation of the mother tongue (Tamaševičius 2016: 248). Moreover, it is developed as what Cameron calls the double discourse, in which a desirable language use is also an instruction on gender-appropriate behaviour (Cameron 2003: 449). As the protection of the archaic language is closely tied to the hegemonic family ideology, one can see how in a paternalistic celebration of the Lithuanian language, hegemonic gender identities are intertwined with those of ethno-linguistic citizenship and the dimension of respectability is presented as a defining measure when setting an opposition between women who follow the traditional naming practices and those who used to - historically - be denied the traditional suffix for their immoral lifestyle. Consequently, surnames with traditional suffixes do not only describe "close family ties and sacred belonging to the family" - they construct them. Inevitably, the traditional suffix is a linguistic form that establishes "a norm of desirable feminine behaviour which is identified with a particular *kind* of femininity" (Cameron 2003: 452): just like in the nationalist family ideology the respectability of the patriotic mother comes from her dedication to the care and

[97] Here it is referring to the negative connotations that the surname with an ending *-ė* has in certain Lithuanian dialects;
[98] Kalėdienė, Laima. "Dėl lenkiškos *w* problemos kaltas Vincas Kudirka!" *Asociacija Talka Kalbai ir Tautai,* Nov. 10, 2017, www.talkakalbaiirtautai.lt/zyma/dr-laima-kalediene/ [accessed April 2, 2020]

protection of the Lithuanian language within the private domain, and the attitudes of women towards the Lithuanian language in their self-naming practices are perceived as indicative of their position towards the family institution in general. Within this discourse, the respectability of a wife/woman comes from her attitudes towards the national language. The only alternative that is perceived as an acceptable and civilized way of marital self-naming is by maintaining the original surname and its diminutive suffix[99]. Women who choose other forms of self-naming can expect public ridicule and punitive rhetorics.

Slavic surnames as an alternative naming strategy

According to the media, when marrying men who possess Slavic (mostly, Russian, Ukrainian or Belorussian) surnames, Lithuanian women tend to choose a lithuanized version of their husband's family name[100] by adding traditional suffixes *-ienė*. Thus, a wife of Ivanov will often become Ivanovienė[101] or Ivanovė[102] regardless or the fact that, due to the foreign background of the surname, they are also entitled to follow Slavic naming tradition by also obtaining an appropriate ending that does not reveal the women's marital status. Given Lithuania's complex history with colonial processes of Polonization and Russification, one could argue that choosing to add the Lithuanian suffix to a Slavic surname serves as a performative speech act in women's aim to calibrate (Cairns and Johnston 2015) their social identities when fulfilling social expectations in protecting male patronymic privilege (Rom and Benjamin 2011) on the one hand and maintaining their ethnic affiliations on the other. As one of the respondents describes, an ethnic dimension of the family name complicates the decisions making process:

[99] Digrytė, Eglė. "Kalbininko siūlymas moterims: imti pavardę su priesaga arba natekėti," *Delfi,* May 6, 2009, https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/kalbininko-siulymas-moterims-imti-pavarde-su-priesaga-arba-neteketi.d?id=21990522

[100] Zverko, Natalija. "Mišriose santuokose rusiška pavardė dažnai yra sulietuvinama." *Delfi.lt,* 10 Dec. 2010, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/misriose-santuokose-rusiska-pavarde-daznai-yra-sulietuvinama.d?id=39552583 [accessed 7 Aug, 2015]

[101] Ibid.

[102] Gudavičiūtė, Dalia. "Turėti pavardę be priesagos yra nepadoru?" *Lietuvos Rytas,* 30 Apr. 2009, www.pasaulis.lrytas.lt/marga-planeta/2009/04/30/news/tureti-pavarde-be-priesagos-yra-nepadoru--5808526/

> I contemplated very long on which surname to choose. The surname of my husband is [Russian with Lithuanian ending *-as*], his father is Russian. [...] My mother-in-law is called [Russian with Lithuanian ending *-ienė*]. To me, this form seemed to be too long and did not sound well with my first name. I thought of keeping my old [birth] surname, but when agreeing on sharing my life with a man, I wanted to take his surname. There were thoughts of choosing a non-suffixed version of his surname with an ending *-a,* but I wanted at least some sign that would show that I am Lithuanian[103]. [e12]

The extent to which the cultural loading (Rom and Benjamin 2011) of the Lithuanian suffix is perceived as an integral part of appropriate [marital] femininity (Rom and Benjamin 2011) is best manifested by the fact that foreign brides - just like local ones - are often expected to embrace the Lithuanian naming tradition at the expense of any social or symbolic capital that might be inscribed into their birth surname. A telling example of how much hegemonic marital femininity is constructed in the nationalist rhetoric of language preservation can be observed in an interview with a Russian journalist Vladas Lasickas who, while a citizen of Russian Federation, is proud of his Lithuanian ethnic background and sees his Lithuanian surname as an integral part of his familial identity[104]. His Russian wife, a three times world champion in high jump, changed her birth surname Kuchina (Ку́чина) to the traditional Lithuanian Lasickienė after she had married Vladas Lasickas in 2017. "There could be no other option", he says to the Lithuanian online newspaper. "I always loved and cherished the tradition of our Lithuanian surname. My sister - Natalija Lasickaitė, my mother - Liubov Lasickienė. Surnames have always been the pride of our family. [...] When we will have a daughter, we will name her Lasickaitė"[105]. Mariya Lasickienė née Kuchina (Ку́чина) herself is quoted only briefly in the interview and claims that, so far, everyone finds it difficult to get used to her new/unusual surname and people struggle to pronounce her surname without making mistakes[106].

[103] She has chosen to add the *new* ending *-ė* to her husband's *Russian* surname.
[104] Kuckailis, Aurimas. "Iš Kučinos - Lasickienė: kodėl pasaulio čempionė rusė pasirinko lietuvišką pavardę." *15min.lt,* 3 Apr. 2017, www.delfi.lt/sportas/kitos-sporto-sakos/is-kucinos-lasickiene-kodel-pasaulio-cempione-ruse-pasirinko-lietuviska-pavarde.d?id=74240766 [accessed Apr. 2020]
[105] Ibid.
[106] Ibid.

According to the Lithuanian media, a vast majority of foreign wives who marry citizens of Lithuania come from ex-Soviet republics[107] and tend to obtain traditionally suffixed Lithuanian surnames upon marriage[108]. One could argue that this practice, besides upholding the patrilineal tradition, serves as a symbolic transition to patrilocality (Rom and Benjamin 2011) - a figurative change of a "tribe" that, in case of intermarriage, also serves as a form of acculturation (Gerhards and Hans 2009). However, as the case of Mariya Lasickienė née Kuchina (Ку́чина) demonstrates, following patrilocal expectations often framed within the traditionalist discourse as *respect* or commitment to the husband and the new family (Clarke et al. 2008: 422), comes with a high price of sabotaging the integrity of one's professional and social identity and, in some cases, with a strong "sense of disinheritance and being banished from familial assets" (Abu-Tabick in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 145)[109]. So while protectors of an ancient Lithuanian heritage often describe the women who choose surnames with an *-ė* ending as mutilating their family's name, patrilocal expectations - especially when they are connected to ethnic intersections - could be seen as practices of dis-embodiment as they disturb the body-name-identity nexus (Pilcher 2017) in relation to situated visible identities (Alcoff 2006). Consequently, while self-naming practices in the case of intermarriage are only partly investigated in this research project[110], further inquiry into institutional and emotional dimensions of patrilocality would be a welcome diversion in Lithuanian women's naming practices research. In the upcoming section of this chapter, however, I investigate women's choices of a Slavic ending *-a* as non-traditional naming practices in contemporary Lithuania. My interest lies in the role of the Slavic ending as an alternative to the Lithuanian endings *-ienė* and *-ė,* especially in cases when both spouses are Lithuanian citizens. Given the role of the Lithuanian surname as a symbolic frontier within Lithuania's ethno-linguistic discourse, I look into the narratives of self-naming of Lithuanian women who chose the Russian surname after marriage and argue that, notwithstanding the widespread hostility towards Russification of Lithuanian surnames, these surnames are embraced as performative speech acts that, while meeting patrilineal national, familial and gendered expectations, serve as linguistic tools in establishing marital identities dissociated

[107] Zverko, Natalija. "Mišriose santuokose rusiška pavardė dažnai yra sulietuvinama." *Delfi.lt,* 10 Dec. 2010, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/misriose-santuokose-rusiska-pavarde-daznai-yra-sulietuvinama.d?id=39552583 [accessed 7 Aug, 2015]
[108] From private interviews with officers of the Lithuanian Civic Registry Office.
[109] Abu-Tabichk (2009) analyses experiences of patrilocality among Israeli-Palestinian women.
[110] I talk about transnational female identities in Part IV of this thesis.

from the traditional suffix *-ienė* - a site of intensive cultural and ideological contention in contemporary debates at both macro and micro level.

As it has been discussed, the Lithuanian surname law allows Lithuanian women whose spouses possess surnames of non-Lithuanian origin to obtain both Lithuanian (that is, adding suffix *-ien-* or using ending *-ė*) *and* original feminine forms of family names. Therefore, notwithstanding if they marry a Lithuanian citizen with a Slavic surname or a foreign citizen, they are able to employ forms of marital surname common to the linguistic community from which their surnames originates[111]. However, punitive public rhetorics towards Lithuanian women who have obtained marital surnames of Slavic origin demonstrate how such notions of appropriate femininity (Rom and Benjamin 2011) are intertwined with ethno-linguistic nationalist discourse on language preservation.

In 2012, a famous news anchor Renata Šakalytė took the original feminine version of her husband's family name - Jakovleva - as her second surname regardless of the fact that both her husband and her husband's father have lithuanized versions of their surnames[112]. Often voted as one of the most appealing figures within the Lithuanian media, Šakalytė-Jakovleva was faced with a massive public backlash over her choice of the surname as anonymous commenters were calling her "a traitor who has sold herself to a Russian… A *vatnik*[113] who needs to disappear from Lithuania…"[114]. Instead, she explains her choice of a surname as a pragmatic solution: "I kept my [maiden] surname because of my work and chose Jakovleva because it is shorter, easier to pronounce and, to be honest, it sounds better/nicer [in comparison to Jakovlevienė or Jakovlevė]"[115]. Similarly, the high rank politician, Rimantė Šalaševičiūtė, remembers the conversation she had with her father when he had found out she was engaged to a man of Russian ethnicity: "my family suffered heavy Soviet repressions and [...] so I was told that if I still want to be part of my family, I need to at least

[111] However, they are not allowed to use 'foreign' letters;
[112] Jakovlevas instead of Jakovlev;
[113] "Vatnik or vatnyk Russian: ватник is a political slur in Belarusian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Russian and Ukrainian languages based on an internet meme that was introduced in 2011 by Anton Chadskiy, which denotes someone who slavishly follows Kremlin propaganda and espouses jingoism". "Vatnik (slang)." *Wikipedia,* Wikimedia Foundation, 4 Feb. 2020, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vatnik_(slang) [accessed 2 April 2020]
[114] From private interview;
[115] From private interview;

keep my [Lithuanian] surname upon marriage. And so I told my husband I am sorry, but I will have to keep my family name"[116].

Both of the above mentioned examples demonstrate how, in contemporary Lithuania, women's surnames serve as key dimensions through which mythical unity of the national and/or familial community is established and reproduced. By carrying their Lithuanian patrilineal surnames, women serve as symbolic bearers of collective identity and embody ethno-cultural boundaries that are seen as threatened by the prospect that more and more women are facing at some point in their lives - how to navigate and negotiate between national, familial, ethnic and gender identities when choosing a family name after marriage. In other words, how to manage the burden of representation (Yuval-Davis 1997) assigned by the patrilocal expectations of one's culture or/and family, but also establish marital identities that bring respectability and social capital associated with female married identities. In the case of Šalasevičiūtė[117], respectability often associated with the marital status had been perceived as less important in relation to ethno-linguistic sentiments ingrained in her family's fear of reliving another, albeit symbolic, colonization. Moreover, while women are constructed as embodying both the past and the future of the nation (Yuval-Davis 1997), their symbolic transition through marital naming practices into another language community would also mean symbolic vanishing of the whole nation. The common destiny of the nation is inevitably imagined through the power of biological reproduction of women, and it is interesting that families of the above mentioned women made very different decisions over the surname choices of their children: while Šalaševičiūtė had kept her Lithuanian surname, all four of her children received the Slavic surname of their father in its original form (Kazačenko)[118]. Meanwhile the two daughters of Šakalytė-Jakovleva were given the Lithuanized version of their father's Slavic family name. When asked about that, she says: "I guess it's because my husband [perceives] himself as Lithuanian. He doesn't even speak Russian!".

---

[116] "40 metų santuokoje gyvenanti . Šalasevičiūtė atskleidė, kodėl po vestuvių pasirinko ne vyro pavardę." *Delfi.lt,* 18 Jan 2016, www.delfi.lt/veidai/eteris/40-metu-santuokoje-gyvenanti-r-salaseviciute-atskleide-kodel-po-vestuviu-pasirinko-ne-vyro-pavarde.d?id=70137188 [accessed 18 March 2019];

[117] She is commonly perceived to be a spinster;

[118] Here the time frame is important to note - she got married and had children before 1990s;

So Lithuanian family naming is unquestionably one of the essential domains of Lithuanian language ideology. And Lithuanian women - as symbolic guardians of the Lithuanian nation - are seen as embodying and preserving the ethno-linguistic heritage of the nation. However, as I hypothesise in this thesis, due to the specificity of the Lithuanian family name system, the exceptionally Lithuanian suffixes that Lithuanian female surnames are constructed with represent cultural stuff in the hegemonic cultural project (Yuval-Davis 1997: 67) and can be seen as major sites of "internal contradictions which different social and political agents, differently positioned, use in different ways" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 67). This establishes, as Rom and Benjamin have argued, situated spaces of ambivalent belonging (2011). Consequently, women who choose unconventional family names often describe traditional suffixes as the heaviest load of the symbolic burden of representation assigned to women. An interviewee whose family name had been Lithuanized[119] after the 1990s, expressed a sense of injustice and discrimination in relation to those who find foreign husbands: "they do not have to ponder over which suffix to choose after the marriage as they can get the [undeclinable] surname exactly as the one of their spouse; we, instead, are the pathetic ones who could only find a Lithuanian husband and so we do not have that option" [a10] . While, at the time of the interview, she had been married for a few years, she said she will not change her surname until women are allowed to obtain the surname of her husband in its masculine form[120]. For her, not taking the traditional *-ienė* suffix after the marriage is a matter of principle against the Lithuanian state that is also supported by the fact that she currently lives abroad with no intention to come back.

Regardless of the above mentioned potentially punitive reactions, some Lithuanian women who marry men of Slavic descent choose the Slavic version of their marital surname as this self-naming strategy frees them from the contemporary dilemma over the traditional *suffix*:

> It's short, it's convenient and I'm no *-ienė*" [d6]

> I am very pleased with my husband's 'Polish' surname with an ending *-a* which does not show my marital status [d7]

[119] Slavic ending *-a* had been exchanged with the Lithuanian suffix *-aitė*.
[120] A topic that will be discussed later in relation to trans-cultural identities;

> The surname of my husband is not of Lithuanian origin. However, both his grandmother and his mother carry it's Lithuanized version. I believe that adding the suffix *-ienė* is a mutilation of his original surname. [...] I am very pleased with my current surname [f13]

I would argue that the fact that some Lithuanian women - when given the possibility - reject the traditional marital suffix and opt for a negatively loaded Slavic version of their surname indicates a bigger social and cultural phenomena that, as I also extensively argue in Part IV of my thesis, is associated with contemporary Lithuanian women sharing conflicting and ambiguous attitudes towards the traditional suffix *-ienė,* both at micro and macro levels. However, as they do not want to be perceived as Russian within the society, they look for alternative social and discursive practices to fix their deficit identity (Reynolds and Taylor 2004).

> I chose not to have *only* my husband's surname because, in Lithuania, people of Russian descent are still treated with suspicion. I personally do not care, but, given those attitudes, both me and my husband decided this [option] would be for the better. We also gave Lithuanized surnames of my husband to both of our sons. [d5]

Hyphenating one's birth surname with the Slavic version of the husband as well as choosing to add an *-ė* ending is, then, often used as a performative speech act that establishes "appropriate" marital femininities and avoids negatively loaded suffix *-ienė*[121] without sabotaging symbolic ethnic borderlines that named bodies of the Lithuanian women are seen as representing. Those practices could be seen as attempts to consolidate their intention to establish marital identities that would both preserve their ethnic identity and establishing heteronormative marital identities outside the normative linguistic framework.

Interestingly, wide public debates regarding traditional forms of female surnames are present in other post-socialist societies. The use of traditional feminizing suffix - *ov*- (plus feminine grammatical endings *-á*) in feminine forms of surnames (e.g. masculine Kováč vs. feminine Kováčová) had been problematized as early as 1990s by members of ethnic minorities in

[121] The political dimension of this avoidance will be extensively discussed in Part IV of this thesis.

Slovakia (Sloboda et al. 2018: 273). While, following an adoption of the FCNM[122], Slovak legislation had been adapted to enable minority members to use their surname without this Slovak suffix, a growing number of cases where the suffix is not used even with clearly Slovak surnames indicates a growing ambiguity of the status of the suffix within the Slovak community (Sloboda el al. 2018: 273). Some scholars explain the proliferation of cases of the non-use of the feminizing suffixes as an outcome of "intensified globalization, international mobility and intermarriage" (Molnár Satinská and Valentová 2016 in Sloboda et al. 2018: 273). In relation to my earlier analysis of the role of women in nationalist projects as embodying ethnic boundaries, the traditional Slovak suffix could be framed as an essentializing nationalist cultural stuff, the burden of representation that Slovak women are expected to carry in order to keep the symbolic ethnic boundaries of their nation. What is important for my further discussion is that - both in case of Lithuania and Slovakia - linguistic reforms related to the traditional surname systems came as an outcome of Slovakia's and Lithuania's effort at the European integration (Sloboda et al. 2018). Importantly, it can be argued that those efforts conflicted with processes of intense nation-building (Sloboda et al. 2018). Consequently, the last section of this chapter attempts to reframe this dynamic intersection of language and gender ideologies in relation to the postcolonial discourse.

Towards postcolonial interpretation

While Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys (2018) claim to be working with critical discourse analysis, they do not frame their findings within the post-colonial discourse, mostly referring to processes of russification. Building on their extensive analysis of the historical formation of contemporary Lithuanian language planning apparatus, I argue that this theoretical paradigm could be fruitfully applied in theorizing the development of current language policy in contemporary Lithuania and, most importantly, in developing my further analysis of contemporary naming politics.

[122] The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) is a multilateral treaty of the Council of Europe aimed at protecting the rights of minorities. It came into effect in 1998 and by 2009 it had been ratified by 39 member states.

As has been demonstrated, Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys deconstruct the epistemological paradigm of Lithuanian language ideology. However, if read as a postcolonial analysis, their study also highlights how certain elements of the colonizer's system of knowledge had been incorporated and internalized within what is perceived as an exceptionally Lithuanian narrative of nationalist survival. That is, certain processes of decolonization have been pushed forward using colonial technologies of extensive surveillance and punishment. On the one hand, wide public acceptance of institutionalized language surveillance can be understood as one of the ways in which "subjugated people come to crave the dominant cultural form" (Moore 2001: 118) - an unconscious internalization of the colonial system of knowledge, ironically, at work within the national paradigm of the preservation of ethno-linguistic identity. As Cameron rightly observes, "desire to control and impose order on language [...] express[es] desire for order and control in other spheres" (Cameron 2003: 449). Moreover, the dominant nationalist narrative of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as once one of the largest European states (of the 14th century) together with the pride over the Lithuanian language as one of the oldest living Indo-European languages could be understood as compensatory behaviour by the subject people: "One manifestation of this behavior is an exaggerated desire for authentic sources, generally [...] purer ancestors who once controlled a greater zone than the people now possess" (Moore 2001: 118; also Kačkutė 2015).

However, there are more subtle expressions of postcolonial compensatory inertia that can be observed in relation to the current state of the Lithuanian language policy. As Ashcroft has argued, "[t]he control over language by the imperial centre [...] remains the most potent instrument of cultural control" (in Račevskis 2002: 40). Scholars of Lithuanian language policy have discussed how cultural control under the Soviet rule was implemented[123] through such strategies as cooptation of Lithuanian ethnolinguistic nationalism and, consequently, by encouraging the standardisation and censorship of the use of Lithuanian language both at the level of form and content. Consequently, what stands out in their study[124] on contemporary postcolonial Lithuanian language politics is 1) a well-documented fear of diversity manifested through the rejection of language variation and, in relation to my earlier

[123] Besides establishing Russian as an official language next to Lithuanian;
[124] And is well enriched within the work of Walkowiak 2016;

discussion on the ethno-nationalist tradition of Lithuanian surnames, the dismay of plurality of identities in general. Or, following Donskis, contemporary language policy in Lithuania functions within the paradigm of late interwar conservative nationalism, which excludes the possibility of cosmopolitanism - or other identities or cultures - from its political and cultural discourse as it sees national identity as belonging to a strictly ethno-cultural domain (Donskis 2002: 29).

Another telling example of the internalization of the colonizer's view of the world within contemporary Lithuanian language policy can be observed within the contemporary treatment of the public space. While, for the Soviet authorities, Lithuanian language was an important tool of Sovietization and "control of the public space and public life" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 198), it is being argued that the post-Soviet Lithuanian language policy has maintained this perception: in the name of national emergency, the public space "is not approached as the common property of people, but of belonging to the authorities and therefore obliged to function according to rules set by the authorities" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 203; for more examples Baločkaitė 2014: 49). Personal names - and surnames in particular - belong to a [controversial] domain where the *private* and *personal* overlap (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 203) and my discussion of the naming politics in relation to the Polish speaking minority has revealed how it works as an exclusionary policy, which causes symbolic/epistemic violence against a group of Lithuanian citizens.

Scholars of Baltic diaspora have constructively argued that "colonialism - or more appropriately postcolonialism - in [the Baltic states] means a sequence of multiple, at times simultaneous colonizations and their postcolonial aftermaths" (Salumets 2006: 430; see also Annus 2018). The postcolonial reading of the study on the development of the Lithuanian ethno-linguistic identity reveals how, during different historical periods, certain aspects of nationalist narratives overlap or are incorporated and, consequently, fuse with colonial discourses. The above mentioned mythologized ethnolinguistic identity that was developed during the early period of Lithuanian national uprising was built on contemporary postcolonial sentiments against "Polish cultural domination and Russian political domination" (Clark 2006: 165). Institutionalized by the authoritarian regime of Antanas

Smetona as an anti-cosmopolitan narrative of conservative Catholic nationalism, it served as a paradigm of national resistance during the period of Soviet occupation (Donskis 2002). However, as it has been discussed, the enthusiasm of linguists to protect the Lithuanian language was appropriated into the imperial apparatus of the technologies of surveillance and control. Moreover, the affective narrative of national emergency that was constructed against the potential threats of English language in the early years of independence (post 1990s) reverberates both in the interwar conservative anti-West narrative *as well as* in well-established Cold War rhetorics (Trilupaitytė 2008) and could, thus, be read as a development of what Homi Bhabha has called a hybrid identity (Bhahba in Annus 2018) - an identity that is simultaneously built on narratives of national resistance and on the epistemologies of a colonizer.

On the other hand, the fact that an introduction of non-suffixed female surnames was only made possible when embedded in European bureaucratic language[125], epitomizes an enthusiastic mimicry of the "West" through the discourse of a return to Europe and sheds light on how intensified nation-building processes are conflicted, negotiated and reconsidered in relation to a discursive and institutional return to Europe (Sloboda et al. 2018). This two-directional postcoloniality - plus the Polish cultural colonialism rooted within the narrative of ethno-linguistic identity - might define the epistemology of incongruity that Donskis observed while analyzing Lithuanian society on the eve of the country joining the European Union and NATO: "[a]ggressively defensive, exclusionist, victimised, and constantly searching for internal and external enemies, Lithuanian nationalism is not yet capable of theoretically reflecting upon itself" (Donskis 2002: 33).

Conclusion

Historian Tim Snyder has argued that the self-image of the Lithuanian nation is that of "innocent sufferers" - a land of heroic people who lived for hundreds of years under the efforts of others aiming to dominate and assimilate them (in Clark 2006: 166; also Balkelis 2009: 123). This national myth calls for constant alertness and mobilization in regards to

[125] In 2003, Lithuania was not even yet a member of the EU;

another potential threat from the outside. The Lithuanian language has been - and remains - the backbone of the national paradigm. The narrative of depleted language due to the long years of russification and the potential new threat that comes with globalization seems to have been convincing enough to Lithuanian society. So much so that, inconspicuously, "the symbolic power of linguists turned into a tangible disciplining of community" (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018: 213). In engaging with a historized approach to language and gender ideologies, this chapter has argued that self-naming practices of Lithuanian women are embedded in both bureaucratically *and* discursively institutionalized nationalist language ideology. This linguistic landscape contains within itself nationalist, familial, gender and ethnic dimensions and women inevitably need to work with, against, or from within those interpretative frameworks in both making decisions about their surname change *and* in constructing their self-naming narratives. As narratives of women who chose non-conventional options of obtaining the *Slavic* version of their marital name reveal, an ethnic dimension of the family name functions both as an impediment *and* a creative resource in constructing marital feminine subjectivities. Aware of potentially punitive reactions regarding their symbolic embodiments of *other* ethnic femininities, they refer to traditional suffixes - and especially the suffix -*ienė* - as a culturally assigned burden which they aim to avoid, thus establishing a discursive affinity with respondents who, as it will be discussed in Part IV, are choosing the *new* suffix -*ė,* and whose performative constructions of contemporary marital femininities are embedded in a discursive dissociation from traditionally named embodiments of marital identities.

PART III: Transnational postfeminism and a case of Lithuania

Introduction

As it has been discussed in Part II of this thesis, an inquiry into women's narratives of self-naming is first and foremost a study of language and gender. In recent years, scholars of media and cultural studies have argued that the concept of postfeminism can be applied as a useful tool in the field of language and gender as it has the potential to "reinvigorate its political impetus" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 1). Analysts of postfeminist culture work on a premise that gendered subjects of contemporary Western democracies are dominated by neoliberal individualism as one of the major Foucauldian knowledge/practice regimes (McAvoy 2015: 25). Consequently, a wide range of academic writing has by now established "empirical regularities, features or patterns in contemporary cultural life that has been widely theorised as constitutive of a postfeminist sensibility" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 2) as a form of gendered neoliberalism (Gill 2016; Gill 2017). Scholars of postsocialism acknowledge the drastic consequences neoliberal rationality has had on gender norms both through "the new materialities of neoliberal economies and, simultaneously, [through] the neoliberal discourse on individualism, personal responsibility, and recognition" (Asztalos Morell and Gradskova 2018: 8; see also Tereškinas 2018; Kovats 2016). However, the potential of reading postsocialist gender formations against the backdrop of postfeminism as an analytic category for cultural critique (Litosseliti et al. 2019) has been practically unexplored (Kolbešnikova 2019).

The naming issue - in the case of British and American contexts that means retaining one's name upon marriage - has particularly strong associations with feminism (Thwaites 2017:

63). In the case of contemporary Lithuania, a refusal of traditionally suffixed surnames is also understood as one of the most visible feminist campaigns in postsocialist Lithuania (Čepaitienė in Mikonytė 2011: 33). Interestingly, as it will be demonstrated in Part IV of this thesis, an absolute majority of the respondents of this study[126] has expressed anti-feminist sentiments in relation to their non-traditional (feminist) surname choice[127]. This double entanglement (McRobbie 2009) where feminist ideas are embraced and repudiated at the same time, hints to the analytic value of postfeminist sensibility in understanding this depoliticizing orientation (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 9).

In what follows, I aim to establish an interpretative framework for my subsequent analysis of self-naming narratives of contemporary Lithuanian women. More precisely, I review existing scholarly work on postfeminist sensibility, it's complex intersections with liberal feminism and neoliberal agenda, a list of feminine visibilities it produces, its current theoretical orientations and its potential as a transnational sensibility. Secondly, I present existing research on how postfeminist sensibility has been domesticated (Alasuutari 2009) within contemporary postsocialist contexts. Finally, I analyse the repertoire of discourses used in campaigning for an introduction of the new Lithuanian non-suffixed female surname during the period between 1999 to 2003 and conclude that this feminist campaign had been succesful - in part - for its postfeminist reframing of the surname problem. Thus, I conclude that, in line with contemporary Western liberal feminism (Rottenberg 2018), the feminist policy-making strategy in relation to the process of language planning in post-Soviet Lithuania had been made intelligible through a discourse that promotes "individualized, autonomous, freely choosing, self-monitoring and self-disciplining subjects" (Orgad and De Benedictis 2015).

Neoliberalism

According to David Harvey, neoliberalism is "a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by

[126] From the general pool of participants;
[127] However, a sociolinguistic study performed by Miliūnaitė (2013) reveals that women with non-suffixed surnames are viewed by the general public as representatives of feminist ideology.

strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (2005: 2). The role of the state within this theory is merely to safeguard the functioning of an institutional framework, within which those practices take place. The founders of neoliberal thought portrayed the state as yet another regime that substitutes "collective judgments for those of individual free to choose" (Harvey, 2005: 5) and, thus, seductively proposed fundamental values of human dignity and individual freedom as an alternative on which to build the new economic project. It comes as no surprise that ideas of neoliberal individualism were appreciated around the globe, from old-style democracies to re-established postsocialist states (Harvey, 2005: 3). Indeed, since the 1970s, adaptations of this minoritarian theory have slowly but steadily been embraced pretty much everywhere around the globe to the extent that it has become incorporated into the way we understand the world and, consequently, has become a "hegemonic mode of discourse" (my italics) (Harvey, 2005, 2).

While neoliberalism is usually explained as an economic doctrine that aims for a limited participation of state power, some scholars argue that this ideology itself can be efficiently interpreted as a form of governmentality, which focuses on technical rather than political methods of "governing and self-governing" (Ong, 2006: 3). This mode of "governing through freedom" (Rose, 1999) strippes vulnerable groups of assets that would previously come from the welfare state and establishes an economic structure that requires its subjects to be free, self-enterprising and self-managing in a wide range of social fields (Ong, 2006: 14).

Following Foucault's understanding of governmentality as a multitude of knowledges and techniques that inform social practices, Ong argues that neoliberal governmentality rationalizes governing and self-governing through "market-driven truths and calculations" (Ong 2006: 4). Consequently, she sees neoliberalism as consisting of two kinds of optimizing technologies, where technologies of subjection inform political strategies of citizenship regulation (regulations of urban spaces, travel and selective recruitment of various agents) and technologies of subjectivity "rely on an array of knowledge and expert systems to induce self-animation, efficiency, and competitiveness" (Ong 2006: 6). According to Ong, as technology of subjection, neoliberal governmentality can be

understood as Foucault's notion of "biopower" or biopolitics; neoliberal technologies of subjectivity, on the other hand, are well theorized by the British school of governmentality grounded on the rationale that "requires populations to be free, self-managing, and self-enterprising individuals in different spheres of everyday life - health, education, bureaucracy, the professions, and so on" (Rose in Ong 2006: 14). The latter school of studies on neoliberal governmentality is invested in the life of power beyond formal political technologies and how it is productive and embodied through technologies of responsibilization (Cairns and Johnston 2015: 153).

Consequently, in his aim to reconcile the axes of structure and agency of neoliberal governmentality, Simon Springer reconceptualizes this global phenomenon as a particular discourse: "a mutable, inconsistent, and variegated process that circulates through the discourses it constructs, justifies, and defends" (Springer 2012: 134). Following Foucault, discourse is "a group of statements belonging to a single system of formulations" (2012: 139), thus neoliberal discourse could be summed up as a set of statements that are embedded in "[m]arket rationality that promote individualism and entrepreneurialism" (Ong 2006: 9). However, it is misleading to believe that "neoliberalism is an ensemble of coordinates that will everywhere produce the same political results and social transformations" (Ong 2007: 3). While definitely a global pervasive metalogic, neoliberalism does not exist as a pure or paradigmatic scheme, but rather as "a series of geopolitically distinct and institutionally effected hybrids" (Peck in Springer 2012: 136). Admitting that we live in an after-math of second wave neoliberalism that is animated by an ethos of self-governing, Ong warns against treating neoliberalism as "a fixed set of attributes with predetermined outcomes" (Ong 2007: 3) as "neoliberal forms [...] are often in tension with local cultural sensibilities and national identity" (my italics) (Ong 2006: 12). Instead, she invites us to develop an analytical angle of research that stays close to the discursive and non-discursive practices of societies in question in order "to examine the shifting lines of mutation that [neoliberalism] generates" (Ong 2006: 12). This is a process that some scholars prefer to call neoliberalization, thus acknowledging the power of neoliberalism "to 'materialize' very differently as a series of hybridized and mutated forms of neoliberalism contingent upon existing historical contexts, geographical landscapes, institution legacies, and embodied subjectivities" (Springer 2012: 136).

Neoliberal feminism

Analysts of neoliberal governmentality argue that the reframing of human social behaviour as entrepreneurial practices inevitably promotes the appearance of "new political subjectivities and social identities" (Brown in Rottenberg 2014: 421). Consquently, a growing body of studies of feminist cultural scholarship is arguing that this hegemonic mode of governmentality has had an affect of transcoding[128] in relation to what can be perceived as main-stream liberal feminism (Rottenberg 2014). For example, Catherine Rottenberg has deconstructed the uncanny blend between the neoliberal rationality and liberal feminism - a fuse that resulted in "the emergence of a contemporary mode of feminism profoundly informed by a market rationality" (Rottenberg 2014: 421). In her analysis of recent popular feminist manifestos, Rottenberg argues that the feminist subject of the late 21st Century[129] has been re-shaped by the neoliberal discourse of individualization into an entrepreneurial self who is initiative, proactive and calculating in how she uses her resources as well as creative and self-dependent while managing a work-life balance (Rottenberg 2014: 422). According to Rottenberg, it is by shifting attention from the social pressures towards "interiorized affective spaces that require constant self-monitoring" that the classic liberal feminism gets depoliticized and remodeled into a feminist version of neoliberal governmentality (Rottenberg 2014: 424). This powerful discursive reconstruction of the feminist subjectivity favors a subject who, while fully aware of the existing inequalities and hierarchies between men and women, has learnt to see structural economic, social and cultural obstacles as an individual project (Rottenberg 2014) or an "internal obstacle" (Sandberg in Rottenberg 2014: 424). It is by refashioning the feminist agent as the sole entrepreneur of their professional and personal success that the neoliberal discourse instigates a feminist subject who embodies self-responsibility, free-choice, self-monitoring and a happy work-life balance (Rottenberg 2014). The effects of this neoliberal transcoding of main-stream feminism, Rottenberg argues, are manifold: the discourse of neoliberal self-responsibilization over one's happy

[128] Stuart Hall in Rottenberg (2014: 432).
[129] Her focus is mostly USA;

work-life balance positions ambitious middle-class women at the centre of neoliberal feminist project and, thus, diverts political attention away from such issues as "wage gap, sexual harrassement, rape or domestic violence" (Rottenberg 2014: 432). Moreover, Rottenberg speculates that an endorsement of neoliberal feminism - as opposed to neoliberal femininity - serves as an important tool for certain imperialistic projects where gender equality is commodified as the benchmark for civilizations: "[m]oving beyond the strategic use of homonationalism or queer liberalism, where there is an instrumentalization of gay and lesbian rights so that western democracies and the USA can assert a kind of global progressive superiority, neoliberal feminism may be the latest discursive modality to (re)produce the USA as the bastion of progressive liberal democracy" (Rottenberg 2014: 433).

Following the notion that neoliberal governmentality colonizes diverse social and political domains, the work of Rottenberg highlights how - while built around key liberal notions of equality, opportunity, and free choice - influential contemporary manifestos of self-proclaimed feminists serve as discursive nexus where neoliberal rationality remakes liberal feminism in its own image (Rottenberg 2014: 432). To sum up, the cultural work done by neoliberal governmentality in relation to different kinds of feminine subjectivities has produced a list of neoliberal identities embodied by "individualized, autonomous, freely choosing, self-monitoring and self-disciplining subjects" (Orgad and De Benedictis 2015: 418) - a form of embodiment that, some scholars argue, finds its gendered expression through postfeminism (Cairns and Johnston 2015).

Postfeminism

Since the early 1990s, postfeminism has been associated with various theoretical formulations (Litosseliti et al. 2019). On the one hand, it is often presented as an "epistemological break" (Gill and Sharff 2011: 3) that marks transformations within academic feminism invested in "critical engagement with earlier or other forms of feminism" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 2). On the other hand, postfeminism is often used as a synonym for the Third Wave feminist movement that has distanced itself from a second

wave feminism while "offering itself as a more 'girly', 'sexy' and certainly updated 'brand' of feminism" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 3). However, some argue that, besides strong generational emphasis, the core political content of this formulation of postfeminism is hard to distinguish (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 3). In addition, the notion of the backlash against feminism is also interchangeably used by some scholars to define popular discourses that perceive feminism as a remnant of the past that is of no further use to contemporary women (Faludi 2006). In her seminal work, Susan Faludi has analysed the backlash against feminism as reactive - as well as reactionary tendencies within contemporary media representations and discourse; however, "the elision of postfeminism with anti-feminism misses a most crucial and prevalent aspect: the ways in which feminist and anti-feminist ideas are entangled" (McRobbie in Litosseliti et al. 2019: 3).

In 2009, Angela McRobbie theorized an important shift in popular media agendas as a discursive undoing of feminist ideology, "whereby feminism is 'taken into account' and asserted as common sense yet simultaneously feared and repudiated" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). McRobbie argues that the contemporary postfeminist gender regime provides women with greater access to certain freedoms, but expects the disavowal of feminism as a collective movement in return (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). Consequently, the final outcome of this discursive (and material) fuse between feminism and neoliberal agenda results in what McRobbie has called "transformed gendered individualization" (McRobbie 2009: 100).

Informed by the writing of McRobbie, Rosalind Gill developed a fourth approach to postfeminism which she calls postfeminism as a [cultural] sensibility (Gill, 2007). She sees postfeminism as "an object of critical analysis, rather than a theoretical orientation, new moment of feminism or straightforward backlash" (Gill and Sharff, 2011: 4) and claims that the complexity of this phenomenon lies in its contradictory nature, as, within postfeminist discourse, "notions of autonomy, choice and self-improvement sit side-by-side with surveillance, discipline and the vilification of those who make the 'wrong' 'choice'" (Gill 2007: 164).

Central to her analysis is the notion that this phenomenon is hugely influenced by the neoliberal agenda (Gill and Scharff 2011: 7). So much so that, due to the striking resemblance between the autonomous, freely choosing and entrepreneurial neoliberal subject and postfeminist femininities, she has recently reframed postfeminism as a sensibility that encapsulates "gendered neoliberalism" (Gill in Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). Moreover, while in earlier formulations postfeminism was closely intertwined with liberal feminism, in her recent writing, Gill has defined it as "a semi-autonomous 'mood', 'structure of feeling' or 'sensibility' whose primary relationships are less to feminism than to global consumer capitalism and neoliberalism" (Gill in Elias et al. 2017: 24). An observation that has been reified by scholars of postfeminism as transnational sensibility, "which has the capacity to take hold even in contexts which have not experienced western-style feminist politics"[130] (Elias et al. 2017: 24; also Gill 2017).

Consequently, analysts of postfeminist culture[131] are invested in a critical inquiry into postfeminism as a "patterned - yet contradictory - phenomenon" that pervades the contemporary hegemonic discourse about gender (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4) through a "circulating set of ideas, images and meanings" (Banet-Weiser et al. 2019: 3). While this postfeminist sensibility inevitably co-exists and intersects with other socio-political systems of categorization and power, a rich corpus of research produced by scholars of media and culture studies recognizes some recurring features that are seen as belonging to the discursive landscape of contemporary postfeminism (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). For example, *the body,* they argue, serves as a key site where the edges of contemporary femininity are being reformulated (Litosseliti et al. 2019; McRobbie 2009; Gill 2007; see also Alison Phipps on the body within a neoliberal value system (2014: 10)).

Gill and other analysts of postfeminism argue that neoliberal agendas contribute hugely to a resexualization of women's bodies (2007). She notices that, within postfeminist media culture, femininity is increasingly portrayed as a bodily property; however - differently from the old times of female objectivization - the male gaze is now being internalized by

[130] As studies like that of Simidele Dosekun (2015) "a feminist movement is not a pre-condition for the emergence and cultural hold of postfeminism" (Elias et al. 2017: 24; see also Adrienne Evans and Sarah Riley 2017).
[131] Self-description of scholars of postfeminism (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4).

confident, independent and assertive female subjects (Gill 2007; Also Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). So much so that, while responding to the discursive intensity around feminine bodies, McRobbie has argued that "patriarchy has 're-territorialised' in the fashion and beauty complex" (in Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). Importantly, the aesthetic labor (Elias et al. 2017) expected in performing postfeminist femininity is framed as freely chosen acts of self complacency "rather than acting according to fierce external pressures" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). Even questions like the growing number of teenage girls who choose breast augmentation are increasingly co-opted by the neoliberal notion of individual choice (Gill, 2007: 10). A notion that, as argued later, has become synonymous to mainstream feminism itself.

Moreover, As Jess Butler has argued, racially exclusive feminist legacy of sex positive subjects has been actively embraced by contemporary gender ideology (Butler 2013: 41). Consequently, within neoliberal, postfeminist consumer culture, the normative requirements of self-representations for young women include a display of sexual knowledge, sexual practice and sexual agency as "'technology of sexiness' has replaced 'innocence' or 'virtue' as the commodity that young women are required to offer in the heterosexual marketplace" (Gill 2007: 72).

Nevertheless, this assertiveness is intensely surveilled by the sexualized culture that only accepts female subjects embodying the heterosexual male fantasy (Gill 2007) or, as scholars of digital media and gender have recently argued - by an intersubjective gaze of a *gynaeopticon* - a gendered, neoliberal variation of Jeremy Benthams's panopticon - where many women watch many women" (Winch 2015: 228). Winch argues that the feminine body serves as an essential tool of self-branding; as an object of intense aesthetic labor (Elias et al. 2017) it provides "the means by which women acquire and display their cultural capital" (Winch 2015: 233). That cultural value, Winch argues, is often merchandised as an embodiment of heteronormative sexuality (Winch 2015), indivisable from actively promoted youthful disposition (Lazar 2017: 65) or youthful luminosities (McRobbie in Gill 2017: 615). A notion that is constitutive of girlish postfeminist subjectivity (a feel-good femininity), this postfeminist girlishness recontextualizes beauty labor as aesthetic play (Lazar 2017). Importantly for my later inquiry into narratives of

self-naming, not only are practices of beautification transcoded as fun pursuits of playful pleasure (Lazar 2017) - following Lazar's analysis of the register of play in the language of cosmetic's advertising, intentional linguistic/semiotic creativity and innovativeness can be employed as a form of symbolic entrepreneurship, where "wordplay, flouting linguistic conventions and the use of irony to index a popular, light-hearted postfeminist identity" (Lazar 2017: 61). This postfeminist celebration of youthism inevitably means "strategic-commercial mobilisation of fear and anxiety about ageing" (Elias et al. 2017: 29). However, a growing body of studies demonstrate the capacity of neoliberal and postfeminist culture to extend into new temporalities of woman's life, such as childhood, the new visibilities of the maternal body (Elias et al. 2017: 29) as well as middle-aged and older women (Gill 2017: 615).

Consequently, feminist scholars of the body have made important observations on the role neoliberal governance plays in the performance of femininities and the relationship between "embodied neoliberalism and fat-phobia, noting how thinness is idealized as an indicator of healthfulness, a corporeal expression of individual responsibility and self-control" (Cairns and Johnston 2015: 157; also LeBesco 2011; Guthman 2011). For instance, recent studies on dieting discourse reveal how postfeminist sensibility is expressed through the narrative of choosing health, where notions of an individualized consumer are reworked into a seemingly empowering version of individualistic postfeminist sensibility through recourse to 1) choice, 2) thinness as an embodiment of idealized (white middle-class) femininity and 3) self-discipline (Cairns and Johnston 2015). Going back to Stuart Hall, gendered neoliberalism transcodes thinness as health and dietary restraint as informed choice, thus maintaining the feminine body "as a site of surveillance, evaluation, judgement, and regulation, with the fear of fatness appearing as a backdrop" (Cairns and Johnston 2015: 171). Unsurprisingly, the neoliberal makeover paradigm cultivated within postfeminist culture publicly scrutinizes women's bodies, postures and their sense for fashion (McRobbie 2009), mercilessly leaving out older or bigger women who are subject to abusive representations (Gill, 2007: 9). Furthermore, McRobbie demonstrates the extent to which working-class women are exposed to this kind of scrutiny and convincingly shows that professional middle-class femininity is very much favored by contemporary neoliberal agenda for it is the middle-class which is more

susceptible to respond to the neoliberal project of "transformed gendered individualization" (McRobbie 2009: 100). Or, as Lazar has put it: "only women of means can partake in prolonged girlhood" (Lazar 2017: 65).

Middle-class femininity

As Winch sums up, key to the success of the neoliberal family are respectability, taste and self-management (Winch 2015: 245) and "the figure of the middle-class mother who is slim and youthful in appearance" (McRobbie 2013: 119) is charged for the successful functioning of this family enterprise. According to Stuart Hall, the middle-class is central to the neoliberal project as middle-class women have always played an important role in reproducing class society (in McRobbie 2013: 119). Victorian angels in the house served as role model mothers and wives as well agents of values related to the middle-class forms of citizenship (McRobbie 2013: 101). Importantly, the pathologization of working class women and mothers "as threats to the moral order" has been an essential part of this process of idealizing and normalising "bourgeois feminine characteristics" (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008: 233). Today, independent and assertive neoliberal subjects of middle-class femininity are valued for being able to adapt, change and reinvent themselves in a fast changing economic environment without failing to perform the role prescribed to them by the heteronormative hegemony (McRobbie 2009: 100). By contrast, their working-class counterparts are exposed to ruthless symbolic violence for their inability to adapt and to maintain respectability (as well as respectable looks) (McRobbie 2009). This new regime of neoliberal subjectivity is even more visible in relation to the working-class maternity as contemporary middle-class mother, who demonstrates entrepreneurial skills in running her family as an enterprise, and is repeatedly juxtaposed with a pathetic figure of that of a working class mother: "typically a single mother with several children fathered by different men, reliant on benefits, living in a council house, and with an appearance which suggests a lack of attention to the body image" (McRobbie 2013: 125). In the UK's mainstream media, an embodiment of this "over-consuming and status driven middle class" femininity is labelled as a *yummy mummy* - a stereotype that taps into the discursive

divide between the *yummy* middle class femininity and *slummy* working class femininity (Winch 2015: 243).

For example, while analysing contemporary UK make-over TV shows, Ringrose and Walkerdine demonstrate how in a post-industrial neo-liberal governance, working class women are scrutinized as a "failed subject and object of consumption" (2008: 241). In an era coined as a "reflexive project of the self" (Giddens 1998), where every subject is expected to constantly perform self-reinvention, it is consumption - not production - that defines one's identity (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008). With a total disintegration of civil society, an autonomous self is exposed to the new bourgeois fantasies of femininity that are normalized and promoted by regulatory discourses that reject class as oppositional and instead deliver a postfeminist promise of self-reinvention (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008). However, Ringrose and Walkerdine argue that working class femininity is essential for the neoliberal project of self-reinventing subject as it acts as primary "vessel" of neoliberal anxiety. They employ Kristeva's notion of "abjection" (1982) which describes how a sense of subjective horror defines borders between the "I" and the impossible "other", while also haunting the subject as a "site of risk and contamination that any feminine subject is at risk of slipping into" (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008: 234). Consequently, working class women are seen as "identificatory sites of desire, disgust, and fear of failure in the constitution of rational, reflexive subjectivity" (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008: 242). In other words, the abjection of working class women and mothers is an essential part of a self-reflective project of contemporary neoliberal feminine subjects.

The narrative of personal choice

While the empowering of women through exercising their free choice[132] has for a long time been associated with feminist politics, according to analysts of postfeminist culture, the use of choice narratives within a neoliberal capitalist societies must come under scrutiny (Thwaites 2016: 65). As a key logic of neoliberalism (Banet-Weiser in Banet-Weiser et al. 2019: 8), the personal choice narrative is constitutive of the neoliberal values of

[132] Especially within the discourse of reproductive rights (Craven in Thwaites 2017b: 65); Also, within the Third Wave feminist agenda (Thwaites 2017b: 58).

consumerism and individualism (Thwaites 2017b). Consequently, the popular (non-academic) representations of feminism encourage women "to embrace the opportunities they have in life and to see the choices they make as justified and always politically acceptable" (Thwaites 2017b: 55). Through the narratives of female empowerment, young women are especially celebrated as the main beneficiaries of socio-political progress and increased opportunities of late modernity that have allegedly replaced traditionalism and gender-based constraints (Baker 2008: 54). The neoliberal narrative of girls' educational success (as well as feminisation of the job market) serves as a central tenet of this discourse (Baker 2008; see also Pomerantz and Raby 2011).

However, critics of choice feminism notice that, while tolerant and inspiring, this popular form of feminism possesses an ability to suppress critical discussions and voices of disagreement (Thwaites 2017: 55). Moreover, they challenge the Giddenian thesis of the reflexive project of the self (1996) as unrestrained by rigid traditional rules and, thus, free to construct their identities through numerous choices and options unavailable for previous generations: "[t]he choice narrative ignores not only the very important place of unthinkingness within norms and traditions, but also that some seemingly freely made decisions are so influenced by societal practice and opinion that they cannot be considered truly free, in Gidden's sense" (Thwaites 2017: 64; see also Reynolds at al 2007). Moreover, as Gill reminds us, "women make choices [...] but they do not do so in conditions of their own making" (Gill 2007: 72). Choices, she argues, cannot be understood as arrived at autonomously, for our preferences have everything to do with our daily contact with our cultural habitat (Gill 2007: 73). Moreover, as Alison Phipps has observed, the mobilization of the *choice* narrative by different - and often conflicting - political agendas, demonstrates that, in many cases, the concept is a meaningless one as "it tends to erase other rationales and motivations, and glosses over complexities" (Hussein in Phipps 2014: 64). While the wide-spread mobilization of the concept within various socio-political terrains makes it an easily digestible message in media terms (Hussein in Phipps 2014: 64), its complicity with postfeminist and neoliberal discourse (Gill 2007: 74) should make cultural analysts wary of its analytical value as it provides an easy route away from otherwise uncomfortable or challenging narratives (Thwaites 2017b: 63). Moreover, its political universality seems to suggest that "any choice made by a

woman can be a feminist one" (Phipps 2014: 135). Furthermore, the lack of attention to its social situatedness strips it from its context and leaves "the process of deciding in itself seen as empowering" (Meyers in Phipps 2014:). All in all, "trapped in precisely the individualizing, neoliberal paradigm" (Gill 2007: 72) the notion of personal choice is built on the consumer's *right* to choose rather than on the political content of the choice itself (Craven in Thwaites 2017: 64). Importantly, the neoliberal fetishization of *choice*, as argued by Gill, reintroduces a widely criticized notion of an "overly rational and overly unified view of the self as well as avoids all the important and difficult questions about the relationship between the psychic and the social or cultural" (Gill 2007: 76).

Sensibility

Reflecting on the notion of postfeminist sensibility ten years after its formulation, Gill argues that "[l]ike neoliberalism, [...] postfeminism has tightened its hold in contemporary culture and has made itself virtually hegemonic" (Gill 2017: 609). Moreover, besides the cultural register of postfeminism manifested through such distinctive gendered features as the focus on the body, the celebration of choice, individuality and empowerment, the transition from objectivification to subjectification, an emphasis on self-discipline and surveillance, and the embrace of makeover-paradigm it has extended into the affective and psychic domains (Gill 2017: 610).

For example, Christina Scharff has inquired into the notion of the psychic life of neoliberalism to understand the ways in which neoliberalism is lived on a subjective level (Scharff 2015). She has observed that neoliberal practices of governmentality that promote the vision of the neoliberal subject as ambitious, calculating and self-reliant have psychosocial effects on the formation of neoliberal subjectivity: "entrepreneurial subjects relate to themselves as if they were a business, are active, embrace risks, capably manage difficulties and hide injuries" (Scharff 2015: 2). Along the same line, Gill argues that the growing tendency of postfeminist sensibility to focus on interiority has certainly been influenced by a turn to character in contemporary neoliberal capitalism[133], producing a list of

[133] As discussed earlier in relation to neoliberalism and feminism;

gendered technologies of the self such as self-esteem, body positivity and the confidence cult (Gill 2017: 618) as well as introducing a psychologized regime of confidence as the new sexy (Gill 2017: 619).

Moreover, in her work with Shani Orgad, Gill has provided a critical analysis of the resilience discourse as yet another regulatory ideal (Gill and Orgad 2018) or affective governance (Isin in Gill and Orgad 2018: 478). Due to its ideological fit with neoliberalism[134], "resilience sits alongside other notions such as confidence, creativity, and entrepreneurialism [...] necessary to survive and thrive in neoliberal societies" (Gill and Orgad 2018: 478). Moreover, important for my later discussion, is their observation that the resilience discourse addresses middle-class women as ideal subjects who have sufficient material and psychological resources to turn injuries and negative feelings and dispositions into self-love, self-believe, and confidence optimism (Gill and Orgad 2018: 481). This work supports a growing body of studies by analysts of postfeminist culture demonstrating a proliferation of a peculiar structure of feelings which rejects "a whole range of experiences and emotions [such as] insecurity, neediness, anger and complaint" (Gill 2017: 619).

As Scharff has observed, entrepreneurial subjectivity inevitably produces its *others* (Scharff 2015). In the case of neoliberal subjects within creative industries, the repudiated *other* stands for laziness and lack of hard work as well as general rejection of vulnerability and dependence (Scharff 2015). Similarly, an idealisation of middle-class women as bounce-backable neoliberal subjects inevitably calls forth the non-resilient working-class women who embody the redundant and disposable other (Gill and Orgad 2018: 490). Similarly, in line with a postfeminist juxtaposition of middle and working-class femininity, Imogen Tyler has demonstrated how affective registers like disgust and contempt are deployed through aesthetic constructions of the chav mum (in Elias et al. 2017: 17). The exclusionary dynamics of neoliberalism (Scharff 2015) are also extensively employed in do-diet discourse where the fear of fatness - epitomized by the underprivileged feminine body - is lurking behind the neoliberal narrative of choosing health (Cairns and Johnston 2015: 171).

[134] More by MacKinnon and Derickson 2012; Walker and Cooper 2011;

Importantly, Cairns and Johnson have observed that women navigate between the two extremes in their performances of healthy femininity: "they work to avoid being seen as an out-of-control eater on the one hand, or as a controlling 'health nut' on the other" (Cairns and Johnston 2015: 154). This process of calibration (Cairns and Johnston 2015) between what is seen as possible embodiments of excess is also discussed by Maria Adamson and Suvi Salmenniemi in their analysis of Russian self-help literature: "[t]he ideal postfeminist subjectivity is sketched in the books by drawing a contrast with 'other', abject femininities: that of a dull housewife, horrible feminist, pushy businesswoman, and a hysterical and clingy woman" (Adamson and Salmenniemi 2017: 309). These examples demonstrate how, in postfeminist sensibility, the idealised feminine subject is expected to perform both bodily and psychic labour to work around internalized knowledge of symbolic punitive repercussions for the possible excess that resides within a foggy space between the neoliberal promise of choice and what is perceived as a lack of moderation in practices of self-control. So, while extensive research into material and discursive manifestations of postfeminist sensibility point towards degraded working-class femininity as an antagonistic embodiment of the entrepreneurial other, postfeminist imaginations of idealised femininity also reveal the presence of other situated forms of abject femininity associated with transgressions[135]. The neoliberal promise of absence of restraint (Laski in Baker 2008) in postfeminist culture is, thus, at the same time both celebrated and penalized, calling forth perpetuous "vigilance and self-scrutiny" (Gill 2017: 618).

Transnational postfeminism

Scholars/analysts of postfeminist sensibility have been recently criticised that, due to their extensive concern with the Anglo-American world, postfeminism is often understood as itself Western (Dosekun in Gill 2017: 613). So much so that postfeminism "identified as existing outside the West, [...] is often relegated to the status of a mere imitation or simulacra" (Dosekun in Gill 2017: 613). Consequently, scholars like Jess Butler (2013) or Simidele Dosekun (2015) have advocated for a more intersectional (Butler 2013) and transnational

[135] "In contemporary media culture we are relentlessly incited to surveil other women's bodies, a project that is enhanced by textual features such as magazine close ups, magnification, red circles and highlighted areas (e.g. to draw attention to cellulite or an un-depilated hair or other
aesthetic 'transgressions')" (Elias et al. 2017: 14);

(Dosekun 2015) approach that challenges the assumed historical linearity of postfeminism, and its singular geographical positioning, and argues for a recognition of postfeminism as a mobile technology (Ong 2006) "which circulates through the mediated circuits of consumer culture" (in Gill 2017: 614). Building on Gill's conceptualization of postfeminism as sensibility rather than a "culturally specific historical moment" (Gwynne in Dosekun 2015: 964), transnational scholars of feminism argue for the usefulness of the concept in considering "how class prosperity and the various lifestyles, mobilities, and imaginaries it affords may engender post-feminist possibilities for women in the non-Western world" (Dosekun 2015: 963). By transnational, they mean disparate and historically situated connectivities which contain meanings, practices, capital, commodities and people[136] (Grewal in Dosekun 2015: 965). Consequently, as a mobile technology functioning as the neoliberal rationality for self-government, postfeminist sensitivity serves as one of those connectivities - or nodes of power (Grewal 2005) - "that do not respect local, national, or regional borders but traverse them and thereby come to constitute other kinds of boundaries and belongings" (Dosekun 2015: 965).

Criticizing an epistemological meta-geography of the three-worlds scheme[137] reproduced within academic writing on the role of neoliberalism in postcolonial transformations, Anni Kangas and Suvi Salmenniemi introduce a set of epistemological alternatives in their quest for decolonization of knowledge in relation to postsocialist neoliberalism (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016). By coloniality of knowledge, they mean "intellectual practices which represent as universal, delocalized, and disembodied such modes of thinking, seeing, and interpreting the world as are derived from Western modernity" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 210). Consequently, they engage with popular theorizations of postsocialist neoliberalism as multiple hybrid formations that have followed an old pattern of neoliberalism as "a unidirectional flow of policy prescriptions or hegemonic ideologies from the West into postsocialist settings" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 211). Against this backdrop, they suggest a dialogical approach to neoliberalism and postsocialism, which suggests a list of epistemological tools that 1) enable an understanding of neoliberalism as a

[136] "These include media networks, commodity circuits, migratory and diasporic movements, and activists, institutional, and state linkages" (Dosekun 2015: 965).
[137] "[a] specific Cold War era articulation of the colonial matrix of power" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 210);

transnational movement and 2) have the capacity to decentre the three-world-model (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 211/212). Core to their dialogical approach is their understanding that "what may be described as postsocialist neoliberalism is constructed through an interweaving of mutually responsive discourses and practices" (original emphasis) (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218). Their approach, thus, makes space for an alternative understanding of neoliberalism: "[r]ather than assuming that postsocialist neoliberalism merely extends, corrects, colors, or comments on neoliberal practices with their origins in the West, this approach suggests that the dialogue extends in both directions. Not only is postsocialism influenced by Western neoliberalism, but neoliberalism has also been shaped by socialist and postsocialist history and experience" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218).

Scholars of transnational feminism have demonstrated how intellectual decolonizing of postfeminism - as a form of gendered neoliberalism - is capable of disturbing epistemological foundations of postfeminism as a Western phenomenon in that their critical interventions have questioned "the historical lineality which assumes that postfeminism must follow feminism in an invariant sequence and with the geographical centring of what Stuart Hall dubbed "the West and the Rest" (Gill 2017: 614). Consequently, I would argue that the dialogical approach presented by Kangas and Salmenniemi helps to further understand postfeminist connectivities (Dosekun 2015) as "mutually responsive discourses and practices" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218). Furthermore, their introduction of the notion of domestication as another epistemological tool is useful in destabilising an understanding of neoliberalism "as a hegemonic formation, without denying the analytical usefulness of the concept of neoliberalism as such" (Smith in Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 221). Kangas and Salmenniemi have argued that the symbolic juxtapositioning between capitalism and state socialism as mutually exclusive formations has been maintained in order to "devalue non-capitalism and naturalize the association between free markets and democracy" (2016: 222). However, the notion of domestication challenges this "one-way model of imposition" (2016: 220) as it suggests an investigation of constitutions of localized capitalist and non-capitalist practices in order to shed light on the liminality of neoliberalism and (post)socialism (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016). This epistemological reframing serves to demonstrate that neoliberal formations in postsocialist societies did not appear from scratch, but were constructed on historically-situated practices and institutions and, therefore,

theorizes "postsocialist neoliberalism as a [dialogical] process in which the act of domestication transforms the domestic as well as the thing being domesticated" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 220). To destabilize the hegemonic master narrative of neoliberalism as something moving unidirectionally "from the active West to the passive East" means to inquire into the politics of knowledge production (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 223). Importantly, because it invites a "consideration of how these connectivivies are structured, what institutions and knowledges they rely upon, and which kinds of subjects they therefore include and exclude" (Dosekun 2015: 965), this theoretical contribution maintains the focus on neoliberalism (as well as postfeminism) as an object of critical inquiry rather than an explanatory framework (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 219).

Feminism bypassed: post-Soviet postfeminism(s)

The fall of the Iron Curtain changed the lives of many women. Groups of Western feminist scholars and activists rushed to post-socialist[138] countries in order to research the lives of women within the region (Ghodsee 2004). Nevertheless, regardless of the heavy financial investment and individual efforts to import feminism - or "feminism-by-design" (Ghodsee 2004) - many Western feminists were shell-shocked by the extent of the rejection which their ideology received. According to scholars of post-socialist gender formations, the reasons behind this intense negativity towards Western feminist ideology are rooted in the legacy of the socialist/communist past (Ghodsee 2004; Occhipinti 1996).

According to Salmenniemi and Adamson, feminism in post-Soviet Russia has been jeopardized due to its affinity to Soviet gender politics: "[d]riven largely by economic, (bio)political and military concerns, the Soviet state implemented a number of politics which in the West were pursued by women's movements, such as legislation of abortion [...], a quota for women in parliament and paid maternity leave" (2014: 92). However, "although ideologically constructed around socialist feminism as a solution for ending oppression of women through their equal engagement in productive employment" (Ghodsee 2004), the

[138] Following Ildikó Astalos Morell and Yulia Gradskova, my use of post-socialist countries refers to the former countries of state socialism or the Communist Block (2018: 1).

Soviet gender ideology turned out to be an emancipation from above: "while gender equality was officially proclaimed, [...] gender relations were apprehended in essentialist terms and male dominance in the public sphere was largely unquestioned" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 91; see also Astalos Morell 2012; Issoupova 2000). To be more precise, participation in creation of production was just one of the roles women were assigned to, as they were also "shouldering the burden of economic and domestic labor" (LaFont 2001: 205). Moreover, even though involved in full time work, women were taking up low paid "feminine" positions in medical and health care, education, banking, and clerical work (Occhipinti 1996: 14). On top of that, they were also expected to be enthusiastic Communist party comrades (Occhipinti 1996). Consequently, as a reaction to the distorted Soviet past, the Soviet stigmatization of Western feminism as bourgeois feminism and the uncomfortable affinity between the two, the post-Soviet period saw a rise of re-traditionalization of gender norms (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 92). In the case of Russia, Western feminism was also framed as a western-imported alien ideology, "incompatible with Russian culture" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 92).

In countries of East-Central Europe, on the other hand, the repudiation of the heritage of socialist gender ideology came with a rejection of all things communist (Occhipinti 1996: 13) and unambiguous negative evaluation of communism in relation to women's emancipation and agency (Gregor and Grzebalska 2016: 15). According to some revisionist scholars, uncritical disavowal of former socio-economic system made post-1989 feminist movement in East-Central Europe "more compliant wth neoliberal reforms, and more likely to draw from Western theories and solutions (e.g. individualism, free choice or flexibility) rathen than look to their own recent history for models of empowerment and justice" (Ghodsee in Gregor and Grzebalska 2016: 13).

Contemporary scholars of postsocialist gender formations agree that "the accommodation of neoliberal governance model had drastic consequences for gendered work, parenthood, care work, and leisure and is associated with specific normative expressions" (Astalos Morell and Gradskova 2018: 6). As Kangas and Salmenniemi put it, "neoliberal democratization, in which civil society and free markets are articulated in a causal interrelationship, has also been viewed by many international organizations and academic commentators as a technology of

liberation from socialist experimentation, transforming the pathological homo sovieticus into a self-responsible and autonomous consumer-citizen of neoliberal capitalism" (2016: 222). Consequently, as the feminist discourse started to circulate in the mass media and in the academic community, it came to be linked to "the liberal discourse of equal rights and opportunities" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 92). Importantly, often instrumentalized by the same agents, human rights institutions and the neoliberal economy have come to be treated as an integral part of social and political post-communist transformations (Gregor and Grzebalska 2016: 12). Therefore, through the support of international organizations and Western aid agencies, "the so-called cultural feminism has been imported into post-socialist countries [leaving] feminists in the region largely blind to neoliberalism's role in creating class inequalities among women (and men)" (Ghodsee in Gregor and Grzebalska 2016: 13). Furthermore, the European Union (a neoliberal project as it is) has contributed extensively to institutionalising a feminism that is concerned with a small fraction of women's issues (Kovats 2016: 6). For example, as a well established tool for feminist lobbying, gender mainstreaming makes a case for gender equality by "selling feminism to decision makers with economic arguments" (Kovats 2016: 6). Importantly, scholars of postsocialist formations have argued that "neoliberalism acquires new characteristics as it moves away from its Western home turf to postsocialist settings" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 211).

The Lithuanian question

Lithuania was one of the countries which enthusiastically embraced the neoliberal tandem of a free market and radical individualism (Jankauskaitė 2016: 102; see also Tereškinas 2018). Fifty years of "restrictive effects of the Soviet communality" meant that the free market came to be seen as synonymous to freedom (Jankauskaitė 2016: 102). Consequently, as feminist ideas and the free market arrived simultaneously, they soon came to be seen as a coexisting phenomenon and "neoliberal initiatives in the labour market were easily misrecognised as trustworthy alliance for women's rights' consolidation" (Jankauskaitė 2016: 102). Furthermore, in a society that already had several generations of economically active

women[139], an agenda of gender equality was quickly commodified by the business sector, thus turning women's emancipation into "the engine of capitalist accumulation" (Jankauskaitė 2016: 103). Margarita Jankauskaitė argues that women's participation in the labour market came to be seen as a key index of gender equality progress as a result of an economically turbulent transitional context, where people's understanding of the well-being and security were very much linked to economic factors (Jankauskaitė 2016: 103). The tendency to associate the politics of women's empowerment to an exclusively economic agenda is well illustrated by recent research: "[Lithuanian] people's appreciation of women's participation in the labour market (as an economic dimension) is improving faster than acceptance of women's political involvement (a power dimension)" (Jankauskaitė 2016: 103). As a result, "[f]eminist initiatives to advocate for social justice in the political agenda are not sufficiently articulated" (Jankauskaitė 2016: 104). I would argue that, read in this context, the process of introducing the non-suffixed female surname in contemporary Lithuania could be understood as a manifestation of how neoliberal feminism (Rottenberg 2014) functions as a powerful rationality that informs policy-making in post-socialist Central East Europe.

As has been discussed in Part II of this thesis, there have been a few attempts to introduce an alternative ending to the traditional female surnames. Organized by a small group of activists, a few complaints were addressed to the Ministry of Internal Affairs to be discussed and, then, rejected by the State Commission of the Lithuanian Language (SCLL). As the analysis of these complaints reveals, the first complaints were more ideologically alligned with second wave feminist agenda as their criticism towards the traditional female surnames was "concerned with securing gender equality, social justice and autonomy" (Thornton 2019: 2). As discussed earlier, the self-naming practices of Lithuanian women are inevitably embedded in both bureaucratically and culturally institutionalized language ideology. Consequently, feminist arguments against traditional female surnames as discriminating and violating gender equality were discarded as ungrounded when opposed to the nationalist call to protect the Lithuanian surname as untouchable cultural stuff (Chatterjee in Yuval-Davis 1997). However, in 2003, the Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson (Moterų ir vyrų lygių

[139] "Before the 1990s, up to 81% of working-age women were employed. However, during the transition period [...] the situation considerably deteriorated, and started to recover in 2002 only (Kanopienė in Jankauskaitė 2016)";

galimybių kontrolieriaus tarnyba) received another complaint[140] that referred to the legal concept of indirect discrimination that had been recently introduced from the European Union Equality directive. Based on the European equal rights law, it is illegal to inquire into the marital status of potential employees and traditional surnames reveal marital - that is, private - information of women thus indirectly discriminating them against men (Miliūnaitė 2013: 82). This neoliberal re-phrasing of the surname problem offers women an entrepreneurial or postfeminist subject position and suggests that women's possibilities to become valuable subjects (Skeggs 2004) - to "exercise choice and reinvent the self in order to maximise [their] life chances" (Thornton 2019: 5) - are being jeopardized by traditional naming practices. Given the fact that this progressive reframing of the surname problem has succeeded in convincing the State Commission of the Lithuanian Language (SCLL) to find an alternative ending to the traditionally suffixed female surname (Miliūnaitė 2013: 133)[141], one could argue that neoliberal feminism provided a strategic language to further advocate for the linguistic and legal change that challenges the nationalist narrative of ethno-linguistic identity[142]. Moreover, the success of this case demonstrates how shifting feminist rhetorics from "We-feminism" to "I-feminism" (Lazar in Litosseliti et al. 2019: 1) makes gendered political issues more intelligible in post-communist Lithuania. This refers to Jankauskaitė's argument that feminism in contemporary Lithuania is understood as a phenomenon linked to economic reasoning rather than social justice (Jankauskaitė 2016: 103).

Litosseliti et al. have argued that, besides being an object of critical inquiry and an analytic category for cultural critique, postfeminist sensibility "may operate empirically [in] doing and undoing gender equality policies" (2019: 1). As a cultural and political, but also an affective and psychological phenomenon, "[i]t manifests in culture, but also in public moods, atmospheres and structures of feeling" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 7). I have previously argued that, according to scholars of postsocialist post-colonialism in Central and Eastern Europe, discourses of *de*colonization are typical of *postcolonial desire* that is directed not on the

[140] As private interviews with activists show, all these complaints came from the same group of activists and were well coordinated.
[141] In fact, the 'fast victory' surprised even an author of the complaint who expected for it to be a much longer battle. Jazukevičiūtė, Dalia. "Vilkienė nori būti Vilkė", *Veidas,* May 29, 2003;
[142] It seems that a more *liberal* approach to the *surname question* was also related to the fact that a number of new members of the *Commission*. Plus, a new Head of the Commission - Irena Smetonienė - had been elected (Miliūnaitė 2013: 133).

fallen master Russia, but on the narrative of return to "Westerness that once was theirs" (Moore 2001: 118). Importantly, institutional efforts at the European integration cause constant (re-)definitions of self-belonging" (Eiki Berg 2007: 49) and often conflict with processes of intense nation-building (Sloboda et al. 2018), in which women play an important role in safeguarding the symbolic boundaries of the nation. Consequently, one could argue, in the case of the Lithuanian non-suffixed family names, due to its capacities to incarnate neoliberal sensibilities (Thornton 2019), postfeminism is made intelligible through a post-communist postcolonial desire as it supports a political discourse of *de*colonisation. To sum up, following Kangas and Salmenniemi, this particular case of postsocialist postfeminism can be seen as an interplay of "mutually responsive discourses and practices" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218) in relation to culturally and historically situated epistemologies of gender relations in post-Soviet Lithuania on the one hand and the entrepreneurial subject of neoliberal feminism on the other.

Applying postfeminist theories in postsocialist contexts

Importantly for my further discussion, Salmenniemi and Adamson present a study of how a postfeminist sensibility is domesticated (Alassutari 2009) in Russian best-selling self-help literature, where historically-situated femininities are transcoded (Hall 2011) when in contact with Western postfeminist discourse and practices, and explicate a list of new gendered subjectivities that arise in these texts as an outcome of this dialogical intervention (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218). I would argue that their work presents a constructive re-reading of postfeminism as a form of economized (Brown 2016) feminism that offers historically-situated-yet-patterned subject positions for contemporary women in the postsocialist block.

Salmenniemi and Adamson use Alassutari's term domestication as a way to understand the transnational life of postfeminism in postsocialist Russia (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 89). They argue that a postfeminist sensibility - while originating from extensive theorizations of the Anglo-American (media) context - has travelled and been appropriated in Russia, where, due to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the transition to a market economy

has inevitably produced "new material and symbolic orderings of gender and class" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 89). As a sensibility constitutive of neoliberal capitalism (Gill 2007), postfeminism in Russia has entered into a powerful symbiosis with self-help technologies, introducing "the normative postfeminist figure articulated [as] a sexually empowered, maximising and optimising possessive individual who seeks to accrue value for herself through continuous labor (Skeggs 2004), but whose autonomy and agency are firmly constrained by the prevailing gendered power structures" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 90). While investigations into contemporary Russian gender regimes (McRobbie 2009) by no means provide a homogenous picture of gender dynamics in other postsocialist states, their work provides important insights into how and why the gender regimes of two ideologies of Soviet socialism and neoliberal capitalism seem to find "mutual responsiveness" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 218) in socio-culturally specific forms of postfeminism. Consequently, I use their work in order to establish a backdrop for my further inquiry into contemporary Lithuanian femininities.

As their inquiry into widely popular psy literature reveals, the Soviet ethical obligation to work on one's personality (*rabota nad soboi*) in order to contribute to the advancement of Communism has been transcoded into neoliberal self-management "in order to achieve personal success" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 93). Today, post-Soviet feminine subjects are expected to engage with multiple projects of the self that require simultaneous labor on 1) personality, 2) femininity, and 3) sexuality, thus semantically connecting the Soviet working woman (Ratilainen 2012) and postfeminist working girl (McRobbie 2009) (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 96). Importantly, this grammar of individualism calls forth postfeminist configurations of post-Soviet femininity by juxtaposing them with the traditional model of femininity as an abject other (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 94). In the case of post-Soviet Russia, this refers to an image of a self-sacrificing mother (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 94).

Both in Orthodox Christian and Soviet gendered ideals, the female body was never seen as a site of sexual pleasure as it "was a productive body harnessed for the economic prosperity of the state" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 99). And just as sexual pleasure was perceived as dangerous due to its potential to distract Soviet subjects from their political commitments

(Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 99), so was the pleasure of consumption (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 96). Consequently, referring to the scarce consumer choices of the Soviet times when "the Soviet ideology emphasized modesty, simplicity, naturalness and moderate taste as key pillars of feminine appearance" (Rudova in Adamson and Salmenniemi 2017: 304), postfeminism in Russian psy literature frames a bourgeois vice of self-indulgence as a well deserved pleasure achieved through hard work (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 97). As Adamson and Salmenniemi conclude, "[r]eclaiming beauty, sexuality and 'true' femininity and the ability to consume shiny goods were seen as 'liberation' from the Soviet project of women's emancipation" (2017: 305).

However, this new normative figure of a sexually liberated woman, valuable for her engagement in paid labor and, thus, entitled to "career, pleasure and self-realisation", is only made intelligible through the framework of heterosexual relationship and romantic love (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 95). In Russian self-help literature, notions of traditional self-sacrifice and maternal care are reframed from the family to the heterosexual couple. Moreover, "coding class into the discourse of normative femininity" (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 96), childcare is outsourced to domestic help and men are instead infantilized as inferior species in need of constant care: "It is well known that all men are like small children. They need care and love, they are often naughty and demanding, they break their toys and like tasty food" (Shatskaya in Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 94)[143]. Consequently, the key ethical values of postfeminist subject are domesticated as essential means in order to perform a heterosexual femininity that is attained via systematic aesthetic, sexual and emotional labor, displaying an intersection of neo-traditional ideas of authentic gender relations and emphasized femininity (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 96).

[143] For investigations into post-Soviet masculinities, see Tereškinas 2015; Kay 2009;

PART IV: Non/neo-traditional narratives of self-naming

Introduction

While a "deeply entrenched cultural norm" (Twenge 1997), in many countries the practice of women acquiring their husband's last name upon marriage remains a highly under-researched academic topic (Clarke et al. 2008: 421) that is only now starting to receive much deserved academic scrutiny (Robnett et al. 2018). Moreover, with rare notable exceptions (Rom and Benjamin 2013), most of the studies interested in the meaning-making of naming practices have been largely conducted within the US (Clarke et al. 2008). Recently, some important contributions to the field have been conducted in the UK (Thwaites 2017b; Pilcher 2017). Victoria Clarker and her colleagues have conducted a survey of existing qualitative and quantitative research of naming practices - including the few conducted with non-heterosexual couples - and have concluded that "[t]he communality of accounts across different studies points to the existence of shared cultural assumption about names" (Clarke et al. 2008: 435). Moreover, while looking into the reasons why women opt for their husband's last name upon marriage, they have argued that womens' sense making of their naming practices "support the notion that traditional marital names reflect traditional approaches to marriage" (Clarke et al. 2008: 422; see also Scheuble and Johnson 1993). Consequently, their inquiry provides a good background for thinking about how narratives of self-naming in other socio-historical and linguistic contexts with patrilineal naming practices engage, negotiate, expand or reverse situated discourses in relation to traditional gender role norms.

In what follows, I present an analysis of the data of this study assembled from interviews conducted with two groups of research participants. Data from the first group of participants called the "General sample" consists of private semi-structured individual questionnaires with contemporary Lithuanian women as well as public media accounts predominantly concerned with women who have taken the non-suffixed family name after marriage either

as a single family name[144] *or* in a form of a hyphenated surname[145]. However, I also present a brief insight into narratives of women who have opted for traditionally suffixed family names[146], hyphenated their birth surname with that of their husband[147] *or* kept their birth surname upon marriage[148]. Together with already discussed narratives of respondents who opted for a Slavic surname of their husband these narratives form the biggest data sample of my study. Another sample consists of private semi-structured interviews conducted with women who are members of a Lithuanian speaking group "Feminism" (*Feminizmas*) on social media platform *Facebook*. Accounts of women who are owners of the non-suffixed family name form the basis of sample[149]. Where possible[150], real names and surnames of women are presented in order to demonstrate the range of diversity of currently existing forms of female naming in contemporary Lithuania. Real names of privately interviewed women are not being revealed in protection of their confidentiality.

As I provide an extensive analysis of the narratives of self-naming provided by contemporary Lithuanian women, I produce a psychosocial narrative inquiry by describing the prevailing discursive repertoires that appear in women's constructions concerned with non-traditional marital self-naming. I argue that the most prevailing interpretative repertoires that are embraced in order to maintain narrative coherence of their autobiographical accounts can be clustered into a number of discursive paradigms: that of *individual choice, aesthetic preference, heterosexual imaginary* and the paradigm of *global dispositions*. As I extensively discuss these paradigms, I construct the thesis of this work and argue that the postfeminist discourse that heteronormative, self-branding, youthful and individualizing *feel-good* femininities serves as a discursive repository for Lithuanian women. Moreover, the use of these discursive repertoires reveals the political content of their unconventional choice which, I argue, refers to a postcolonial desire of Lithuanian women to embody new, "Western" heteronormative femininities that are construted as a stark oposition to the Soviet femininity often seen as embodied by the figure of the mother-in-law.

---

[144] Coded as [e] within my analysis. Surname ends with *-ė*
[145] Coded as [d] within my analysis. Surnames end with *-aitė, -ytė, -utė + husband's surname ending with -ė*
[146] Coded as [a] within my analysis. Surname ends with *-ienė*
[147] Coded as [b] within my analysis. Surnames end with *-aitė, -ytė, -utė + husband's surname ending with -ienė*
[148] Coded as [c] within my analysis. Surname ends with *-aitė, -ytė, -utė*
[149] Coded as [f] within my analysis.
[150] Usually when quoting self-naming accounts of women as presented within the media.

Traditional surmarital names: *-ienė*

In summarizing data from five different qualitative studies, Clarke et al. draft a number of reasons which women provide in relation to their traditional naming choices:

> "(i) to adhere to tradition and convention; (ii) to mark their commitment to their husband and new family; (iii) to symbolize a new personal identity; (iv) to bask in the 'reflected glory' of their husband's name; (v) practical and linguistic concerns (such as avoiding confusion about their relationship status and disliking their name); (vi) emotional and relational consideration; and (vii) concerns about children not sharing the same last name as both of their parents" (Clarke et al. 2008: 422).

Interestingly, respondents in my study who have opted for a single traditional Lithuanian suffixed surname (ending with *-ienė*) engage with a number of above-mentioned reasons when constructing their naming narratives.

> I think surnames with *-ienė* ending is an old tradition and I do not give too much importance to what this [tradition] stands for. [...] I am generally inclined to maintain and support traditions. [a1]

> My transition to *-ienė* was quite natural. [...] One thing, I did not want to keep my birth surname (because I had always been identified with my parents and their achievements. Also, they were going through divorce at the time). Also, a surname with an ending *-ienė* provides a certain status for a woman. And I want to feel like a woman. [a2]

Similar discursive patterns can be observed in narratives of traditional naming within the Lithuanian media:

> "All the married women in the family have *-ienė* ending. I did not want to break the tradition and be an outcast"[151]

[151] Jolita Ulevičienė in Kutinskaitė, Šarūnė. "Jaunamarčių rebusas - pavardė." *Diena.lt,* 23 Aug. 2008, www.diena.lt/naujienos/vilnius/miesto-pulsas/jaunamarciu-rebusas-pavarde-485699

"First of all, I share traditional views. [...] I find it beautiful when a woman has her husband's surname. [...] I think if you agree to marry a person you should also take his surname"[152].

"Why get married if you do not want to be -ienė?"[153]

However, while the majority of the thematic repertoires overlap with the ones outlined by Clarke et al., they are also ideologically embedded in Lithuanian ethno-linguistic narrative (which I have extensively discussed in Part II of this thesis). (viii) Pride in an old "ancient" language tradition and (ix) moral responsibility in protecting it pertains most of the narratives of traditional marital naming:

"I had a possibility to be convinced about the uniqueness of our diverse traditional surnames while travelling [...] to foreign countries [...]. Foreigners [...] were generally surprised that there is a country in Europe in which one not only can tell the person's gender [sex?] but also the marital status of a woman. [...] This for them was a miraculous discovery. [...] I am all for the tradition that makes us unique in Europe. [...] This is why my surname is Domarkienė and not some Domarkė. Plus, I respect the talented family of [my husband]"[154].

"The change from the maiden surname to the one of the husband manifests my attitude to the person I am marrying. I like that the Lithuanian language is ancient and it does not appeal to me that the new forms of female surnames sound Latvian[155]. [...] I like that we have something so antique!"[156]

I chose *-ienė* because, to me, this ending is like some old precious tiara from the 16th century which I have inherited from the past. The precious germs in it - an ending *-ienė*. To some, these breadcrumbs of an old language have no meaning, to me - they are like jewellery[157]

---

[152] Raminta Vasiliauskienė in Klimčiauskaitė, Agnė, "Laidų vedėja R. Vasiliauskienė: jei sutikai tekėti, priimk ir to žmogaus pavardę." *Diena.lt,* 18 Feb 2017, www.diena.lt/naujienos/laisvalaikis-ir-kultura/zvaigzdes-ir-pramogos/r-vasiliauskiene-jei-sutikai-teketi-priimk-ir-zmogaus-pavarde-797518?psl=2

[153] Valevičienė, Daiva. "Ponia pageidauja pono pavardės." *Kauno diena,* 9 Aug. 2005, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/ponia-pageidauja-pono-pavardes.d?id=7252585

[154] Kristina Domarkienė in Skučaitė, Virginija. "Unikali tradicija ar unifikacija?" *Diena.lt*, 5 May, 2009, www.diena.lt/naujienos/lietuva/salies-pulsas/unikali-tradicija-ar-unifikacija-450203

[155] Many Latvian female surnames mostly have an *-ė* ending and only define the gender, not the marital status;

[156] Rūta Janutienė in Vozbutaitė, Jolanta. "Kokią pavardę renkasi ištekėjusios moterys?" *Moteris.lt,* 11 May 2009, www.moteris.lt/psichologija/kokia-pavarde-renkasi-istekejusios-moterys.d?id=59664265 [accessed 19.11.2013]

[157] Gerda. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

In fact, this notion of pride and obligation to protect the language is also expressed by some women who did not change their surname upon marriage and kept the traditional birth surname with a suffix *-aitė*, *-ytė* or *-utė*:

> "Women need to cherish their surname, not distort it. I do not think it is necessary to adopt the surname of your husband, but one should not deform it"[158].

Same applies to some women who never got married:

> "By renouncing our traditional surnames [...], we deplete our language and our culture, we are choosing the road of unification [with Europe]"[159]

It must be noted, however, that the above mentioned surname keepers belong to an older generation of Lithuanian women who - being actresses, journalists, artists or writers - had been culturally excused from obtaining the surname of their husbands upon marriage - a phenomenon that deserves further historical analysis[160]. In fact, younger participants in my study who are somewhat affiliated to creative industries, expressed having received less social pressure to keep their surname upon marriage due to their profession. While this tradition of famous women in Lithuania keeping their birth surname upon marriage needs more historized investigation, it could be argued that women's consideration of keeping their maiden surname are made intelligible through the neoliberal reframing of the self as expected to always prioritize their interests to increase their human capital (Oksala 2011: 111).

> I think that many people who share traditional values were more forgiving because it is common for women of my profession to keep their birth surname. [c3]

> I knew since I was a child that only female artists and generally super cool [women] do not change their surname into *-ienė*. I am not an artist, but … maybe I am an unfulfilled one [c5]

[158] Doloresa Kazragytė in Skučaitė, Virginija. "Unikali tradicija ar unifikacija?" *Diena.lt*, 5 May, 2009, www.diena.lt/naujienos/lietuva/salies-pulsas/unikali-tradicija-ar-unifikacija-450203
[159] Ramutė Skučaitė. Ibid.
[160] During the suffragist movement in America, for example, actresses, singers and writers were "excused" for maintaining their birth surname due to it "merchantable value" (Garisson in Omi 1997: 188)

I have not achieved anything extraordinary to think of my maiden surname as my own *brand* [a2]

Hyphenated surnames: *-aitė + -ienė*

Based on their inquiry into existing research, Clarke et al. also list reasons why women tend to keep or hyphenate their surnames and argue that they are perceived by the researchers of naming practices as expressing a non-traditional approach to marriage and gender norms (Clarke et al. 2008: 422). The key reasons behind their choice to either keep or hyphenate their names are: "(x) to symbolize their independent role in marriage and maintain a separate identity; (xi) practical and linguistic concerns (such as avoiding paperwork or the aesthetic value of a name); (xii) to maintain a continuity of personal or professional identity (not wanting to erase their past identity and accomplishments); and (xiii) to maintain a connection with their family of origin (Clarke et al. 2008: 423)[161]. I would argue that, according to my data, all of the above mentioned concerns are expressed by women who have decided to hyphenate their surnames. Furthermore, they also reveal (xiv) tensions between marital and ethnic identities; and (xv) the reluctance to share their surname with their mother-in-law.

> My maiden name is part of my identity. Also, being recognizable is an important part of my job. I consider the choice of the husband's family name with respect to my husband. [b1]

> I was 30 years old when I got married [...]. I feel at that age my personality and my identity had been formed and so I did not want to become someone else. [...] I did not like the surname of my mother-in-law [...] It is hard to suddenly assimilate yourself with your mother-in-law, even if you have a great relationship with this person. I did not keep my birth name because I happily accepted my ties with the new family, and I feel pleased to show this connection with my surname. Plus, I was pregnant when I was getting married [...] Undoubtedly, I wanted to share my surname with my child. [b2]

> I wanted very much to keep my maiden surname because I find it so beautiful [...] and fits my personality. But I also want to have the second name of my husband. As my husband is well known in our field[162] [...] I understood his surname will be of use for me. [...] I did not take only his surname

[161] While quoting Clarke et al. I use different numerical organizing;
[162] They are both musicians;

> because of dominating attitudes towards the people of Russian ethnicity. [...] I wanted people to know that I am Lithuanian. [b3].

I would argue that, while preoccupied with the questions of individual, professional and ethnic identity, narratives of women who have chosen to hyphenate their marital surname by obtaining a full suffixed version of two surnames can still be seen as traditional narratives of naming that centre on doing/being family (Clarke et al. 2008). While birth names are seen as an important part of women's subjectivity - as well as an important repository of cultural capital - their accounts are constructed on the cultural imagination that female marital femininity ought to be affiliated to the husband and his family. patrilineal naming conventions also further complicate the dilemma of identity construction[163]:

> Now that we are expecting our [first] child and planning to give him the surname of my husband, I start thinking that I will be the only one with a different surname in my family. So I am reconsidering a possibility to have a hyphenated surname [c2]

Surname keepers: *-aitė*, *-ytė*, *-utė*

It has been already discussed that, in contemporary Lithuania, traditional approaches to marriage are inevitably intertwined with traditional approaches to the use of the Lithuanian language; more precisely, to the use of traditional Lithuanian female marital surnames *-ienė*. Conversely, testimonies within the Lithuanian media reveal that the option of keeping maiden surnames with suffixes *-aitė, -ytė, -utė* upon marriage is the least common naming practice that women opt for upon marriage[164]. The autonomy of childless, unmarried or lesbian women had long been seen as "a sign of disorderly society or nature gone awry on the one hand, or of individual failure to 'adapt to femininity' on the other" (Oksala 2011: 114). The fact that mature women with the traditionally suffixed maiden surname embody an autonomous figure of an unmarried woman is definitely one of the reasons why they are perceived as figures of deficit identity (Reynolds and Taylor 2004). My own data also shows that women who chose to keep their birth surname make the least common group in my research on marital naming. Supporting an observation that "women tend to encounter

[163] I will come back to this issue later in this chapter;
[164] Juškevičienė, Jurgita. "Naujoviškos moterų pavardės kol kas retos." *Šiaulių kraštas,* Sept. 14, 2009, p. 23.

stereotypes when they break with tradition by retaining their own surname after marriage" (Robnett 2018: 59; also Robnett et al. 2016), participants of my study admit haven experienced criticism over their choices and are aware of the existing categorizations that women with maiden surnames still face in Lithuanian society. As one of the respondents confesses: "I see a lot of names and surnames due to my work and I do catch myself thinking "wow, she is *that* age and still unmarried" [f12]. Another participant with a traditional family name *-ienė* has described her transition from being legally single to becoming a married woman:

> The only thing that really changed after I got married was the sudden change in the way I started to be treated by my customers. When I had my maiden surname I tried to even dress up to look older because people - mostly men - would arrive with certain preconceptions as they assumed they had been dealing with a young girl. I was shocked to witness a sudden change in their attitudes and the respect I receive now [a7]

> It seems that [...] to remain *-aitė, -ytė, -utė* is a real humiliation. It is a very powerful label. For example, my colleague who did not know me before I started my new job, was convinced that she will now have to work with a horrible career-oriented loner [c5];

> I did not rush to change my passport after marriage [...] I became pregnant, regular visits to the doctors started. On my first visit, I received a comment: "*-aitė,* and already pregnant. Children must be born in the family"[165]

As I mentioned earlier, women of certain professions tend to be less criticised over their non-traditional naming choices. The rest of the respondents from this group admit haven experienced criticism over their choice:

> The family of my husband reacted in a very traditional way [to my choice to keep my surname] by getting offended that their surname is not good enough for me. [c7]

> I had some really heated debates with my grandmother about the *ugliness* of my current surname and the beauty of the surname of my husband. I did not give in. I stick to my right to maintain one's surname. [c5]

[165] Nika. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

When giving the rationale of their choices, they refer to a list of meanings already discussed in relation to a group of respondents who have decided to hyphenate their surnames. Consequently, notions of independence and individuality of personal identity, pragmatic concerns, desire to maintain professional identity and to stay connected with the family of origin (Clarke et al. 2008: 423) also appear in narratives of these women.

> Many people I know - and also my husband - call me after my maiden surname. It has grown with my personality. Plus, I like my kin. [c6]

> I found it really practical that I will not have to change my documents after the marriage [c2]

> My grandfather was German [and] my family had paid a high price for this surname. My grandfather was deported to Siberia because of his ethnicity and - when he returned - a Lithuanian ending was added to his surname to avoid further confusion [...] As I do not have any brothers, I find it important to uphold my roots[166] [c7]

However, while in the group of double surnames, keeping a maiden surname was seen as a way to maintain personal and professional visibility and to individualize a traditional marital surname which is often shared with the mother-in-law, the surname keepers are more critical of the patrilineal practices both at the ideological and linguistic level - injustice is observed both in the fact that women need to submerge their previous identities and in the fact that men do not have the corresponding suffixes that show their marital status.

> I consider the change of the surname to be a faulty relic from the past. Your identity and all that you are is being hidden under some nickname [...] Everything gets hidden under it. [c8]

> I started questioning from an early age, why *-aitė* or *-ienė* exist, but male surnames do not show their marital status. It felt like such an injustice to change your own surname after getting married [...] [c3]

> I consider the change of the surname into that of the husband to be an enforced rule [c7]

[166] This respondent - together with her sister - have, thus, taken the measures to get rid of the suffix *-ytė* and have both kept their *German* surname after marriage;

> I never wanted to be *-ienė*. I knew from a very early age that I will be *-aitė* for the rest of my life and that I have enough courage to afford this. To me, *-ienė* is a patriarchal relic, a confirmation that you belong to the family of your husband. [c5]

Concerns with the aesthetic value of the family name observed by Clarke et al. (2008) are also present within these accounts. However, differently from the studies conducted within English speaking communities, this repertoire of self-naming narratives by Lithuanian women is connected to the aesthetic - semantic and phonetic - qualities of various surnames created using available female suffixes.

> At first, me and my husband were considering that I will choose a hyphenated version of the surname adding his surname with the *new* [*-ė*] ending. But both found this version of the surname simply not beautiful, my husband was jokingly asking me not to distort [his surname]. The traditional form also sounded strange, turned me into some sort of auntie, I really did not like it. Thinking about it now, it is strange to realize how much importance was given to the simple sound but not some more important motives. On our way to register for the marriage[167], we were still discussing what to do with the part of the surname after the hyphen. When it was time to write down the choice of the surname after marriage, I was about to write down the two surnames [with traditional endings *-aitė* and *-ienė*], but my husband suddenly said that it is not a big deal if I only keep my own, and I happily did just that. [c2]

This narrative gives an important account of the decision making process that women go through when facing the surname question. While it is clear that this participant had been determined to keep her birth surname after marriage, her final decision to not obtain a hyphenated surname of her husband was influenced by a few factors. One of the most important ones is the aesthetic value of the potential name. As she describes, she was considering both available options and both of them sounded wr*ong* to her: the non-suffixed version with an ending *-ė* - while supporting her political inclinations - did not seem to hold an aesthetic appeal. The traditional version with the ending *-ienė* brings a sense of contradictory embodiment (Pilcher 2017) as it seemed to be "turning her into an auntie". As I demonstrate later in this chapter, the notion of aesthetic appeal - both against the suffix *-ienė* and in support of an *-ė* ending - dominates narratives of women who have opted for the *new* surnames after marriage.

[167] This usually happens two weeks before the wedding ceremony;

Another factor, which is often overlooked in the research on naming practices[168], is "the role [that] heterosexual men play in their wives' marital surname decision-making" (Robnett 2017: 826). The construction of the first sentence of the last quotation [from respondent c2] reveals how much the process of female name-making - while constructed on the paradigm of personal choice - is rarely ever a decision of a woman alone. As Michael Heckt has also observed, "[social] identity becomes a property of the relationship because it is jointly negotiated" (in Laskowski 2010). Especially because, in most cases within my data, the decision revolves around the question "what is to be done with the surname of the man?". As it has been demonstrated by some scholars of naming, some men do pressure their wives to opt for their surnames after marriage as "having a wife who retains her own surname would reflect negatively on their masculinity" (Robnett et al. 2017: 826). Moreover, in the case of Lithuania, the potential pressure from the future spouse is culturally enhanced by the ethno-linguistic narrative. Consequently, in the next part of this chapter, I engage in more depth with issues of personal choice and agency in relation to the narratives of women who have obtained the *new* form of the marital surname after marriage.

The modern surname - *ė*: from labels to brands

Two main hermeneutic frameworks of reasoning appear within my data both from the media analysis and from structured written interviews with the women who have opted for the non-suffixed version of their family name[169] after marriage. Testimonies in relation to the choice of the new surname refer to 1) resignification of culturally and symbolically loaded female marital identities and 2) challenging the potential discrimination in the job market. Interestingly, the second one reiterates the (neoliberal) feminist narrative promoted during the campaign for the new surname by the grassroot movement in the begining of the 2000s, although it corresponds to a small fraction of all the naming narratives obtained. The first one, however, is the prevailing framework and will be investigated through the theoretical framework offered by the analysts of postfeminist sensibility. While, as has been

[168] Except for the study of Rom and Benjamin 2013;
[169] There is another segment of women with -*ė* ending - those who chose to have this surname after the divorce; It will be discussed separately;

demonstrated, the name keepers in this study have consistently expressed criticism to the marital surname tradition (both at ideological and linguistic/symbolic level) and also scored high in expressing feminist sentiments, I would argue that, even though the holders of the new surname challenge the Lithuanian linguistic naming tradition, they could still be seen as expressing functional fixedness (Pilcher 2017) or a neo-traditional approach to the marital norms. Very rarely did respondents from this group refer to the injustice within the traditional naming practices and their subjectivity tends to be located within the heteronormative framework of patrilineal naming. To be more precise, Lithuanian women who choose the new feminist surname make naming choices without breaching the rule of hegemonic patrilineal naming practice. The majority of interviewed women with an *-ė* surname obtained the non-suffixed version of their husband's family name upon marriage making it possible to argue that this historically located phenomenon is closely linked to the renegotiation of marital femininities in contemporary Lithuania.

The Choice Paradigm

As an integral part of the womens' rights struggle, the right to choose one's family name[170] is a founding narrative of the Western feminist discourse (Hoffnung 2006: 818). Similarly, the celebration of an individual choice is one of the most common discursive repositories employed within the media discussions in relation to the introduction of the *-ė* surnames. Aušrinė Burneikienė, the head of the Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsperson at the time, argued for women's right to exercise their freedom of choice in order to be able to live a dignified life[171]. Similarly, Irena Smetonienė, who was then the Head of State Commission of the Lithuanian Language, responded to the criticism that she is protecting the interests of feminists instead of preserving the national language[172] by arguing for "women's right to define their own identity"[173]. Responses from women who have chosen

[170] In the US, women gained their right to keep their birth surname upon marriage in 1975;
[171] Digrytė, Eglė. "Grupė kultūrininkų ir lituanistų: neutrali moters pavardė rodo amoralų gyvenimą," *Delfi,* April 29, 2009, https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/grupe-kulturininku-ir-lituanistu-neutrali-moters-pavarde-rodo-amoralu-gyvenima.d?id=21886326
[172] "Kam moterims vyriškos galūnės?" *Respublika,* May 7, 2009, www.respublika.lt/lt/naujienos/lietuva/kitos_lietuvos_zinios/kam_moterims_vyriskos_pavardes_atnaujinta_1241,print.1
[173] Ibid.

non-traditional surnames in re-constructing their social identities also reveal they rely on the discourse imbedded in what Rachel Thwaites (2017b) has termed choice feminism:

> I think it is great that women can choose [e2]
>
> I am happy that there a possibility for women to choose a surname as they wish [f14]
>
> Womens' choices need to be respected [f2]

Choices, however, should not be perceived as arrived at autonomously as they have much to do with our continuous exposure to our cultural habitat (Gill 2007: 73). Core to the social construction of gender (Pilcher 2017), naming traditions are socio-symbolic norms and practices (Butler 1998: 520) or technologies of gender (Bartky in Oksala 2011) that play the role of normative habits - "mechanism[s] that produce a stable and enduring pattern of being and creates an illusion of a permanent gender core or essence" (Bartky in Oksala 2011: 107). The power of habit lies in its elusive intertwining of coercion and free volition (Oksala 2011: 107). While it is true that - to this day - Lithuanian women have quite a few linguistic options in constructing their social identities, the negativity and criticism towards the non-suffixed surnames represented both within the media discussions and described in private communication with the respondents, challenges the perception of self-naming practices as the reflexive project of the self (Giddens 1996), unaffected by traditions, social pressures and shared cultural imaginations. More often than not, narratives of self-naming by women who have opted for some form of non-traditional marital surname reveal that female surnames in Lithunian society continue to be sites of struggle (Mills 2003: 88), and women try to carve their family name into something that feels closest to their subjectivity. Interestingly, as narratives of divorced women later reveal, this is a continuous process that poses dilemmas at various crisis points or critical transitions (Pilcher 2017: 826) of women's lives: marriage, naming their own children, and divorce.

While there is no legal obligation for women in Lithuania to change their surname upon marriage, as they are socially expected to align both with marital and linguistic naming traditions. However, using the paradigm of choice, both media representations and individual narratives of self-naming by Lithuanian women assume that women are the sole

decision makers in relation to their marital naming options. Overlooking the potential sources of pressure and criticism towards the new surname, the media discourse both at local and national level repeatedly reiterates the idea that most Lithuanian women prefer to choose the traditional surname on marriage, concluding that the *new* non-suffixed option has not received much popularity[174] [175] [176] [177]. In fact, according to the available statistics from 2011, only around 10-15 percent of the brides choose the new form of female surname on marriage every year[178]. However, as some scholars of naming practices have already observed, naming decisions do not appear in a vacuum - heterosexual men play an important role in the decision-making process of their wives" (Robnett 2017; see also Jones et al. 2017; Thwaites 2013; Rom and Benjamin 2011). So many times - in private conversations - married Lithuanian women confessed they had considered obtaining a non-suffixed family name, but gave up on this idea after haven been exposed to what some feminist scholars call marital silencing (Clair in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 165). As one of them has explained, after experiencing a fierce opposition from her future husband regarding the potential choice of a non-suffixed marital surname, she chose to drop the topic altogether as she "did not want to start an argument two weeks before the wedding" [a9]. Unsurprisingly, testimonies of Lithuanian women who have opted for non-traditional marital naming demonstrate that non-suffixed surnames are often received as an object of ridicule. And even when the opinion of others is regarded as insignificant to their decision making process, the role of the (future) husband is often perceived as the only one that matters, often suggesting that the marital surname of a woman is a joint decision of the couple.

The role of men

Both within the media representations and in private interviews numerous women mention experiencing public ridicule and open confrontations from family members, public and

[174] Mikelionis, Dalius. "Biržietės pavardžių trumpinti neskuba." *Biržiečių žodis,* 23 June 2009, p. 11.
[175] "Neutralios moterų pavardės plačiai nepaplito." *15min.lt,* 9 Apr. 2011, https://www.15min.lt/naujiena/laisvalaikis/ivairenybes/neutralios-moteru-pavardes-placiai-nepaplito-61-145389
[176] Juškevičienė, Jurgita. "Naujoviškos moterų pavardės kol kas retos." *Šiaulių kraštas,* 14 Sept. 2009, p. 23.
[177] Savickienė, Daiva. "Trumpos pavardės neapžavėjo." *Panevėžio balsas,* 23 Dec. 2011, p. 2.
[178] Baronienė, Daiva. "Neutralios pavardės plačiai nepaplito." *Lietuvos žinios,* 9 Apr. 2011, p. 3.

religious servants[179] and officers of the Civil Registry Divisions in relation to their choice of the marital surname.

> "A vicar at the church has tried to talk me out of this decision saying that I am betraying old traditions of my nation and that is already a sin."[180]
>
> My own gynecologist told me: "Oh, so you are neither this, nor that?" [f19]
>
> A staff member in my health clinic has commented that surnames with an ending *-ė* is an unacceptable and stupid caprice [e12]
>
> Before filing the documents at the Civil Registry Office, I was 100 percent convinced I would keep my maiden surname after marriage. Then the woman who works there started nagging me that my husband and my children will share their surnames, but I will not. [...] So I decided to take his surname [with an ending *-ė*] [e4]

According to one of the interviewees within the Lithuanian media, men repeatedly ask her if she had chosen the non-suffixed surname because she wants to hide that she is married, aims to look young forever or it is because she is ashamed of her husband. Moreover, they insinuate that they would never let their wife mutilate/distort their surname[181].

An aphorism that slowly gained its popularity after an introduction of the *-ė* surname neatly sums up the general public attitude towards the holders of the new surname: *Yra karalius ir karalienė; ir yra durnius ir durnė.* (*There is a king and a queen; and then there is a (he) idiot and (she) idiot*). Using both grammatical and semiotic analogies between the two sets of words *King* and *Queen* and *Idiot* (*m*) and *Idiot* (*f*), this popular statement makes an insinuation about the role a woman symbolically assigns to her spouse when choosing her marital surname. As an example of what Bourdieu has called symbolic violence (1991), this modern allegory does two things at once - it attacks a woman who has chosen an *-ė* surname and comments on the masculinity - or lack of - of their husbands. What it seems to suggest is that a woman who chooses to add *-ienė* suffix upon marriage sees her future

[179] Jutkonė, Vaida. "Pavardė - iššūkis netolerantiškai visuomenei" *Vakarų ekspresas,* 21 July, 2007, www.ve.lt/naujienos/lietuva/lietuvos-naujienos/pavarde---issukis-netolerantiskai-visuomenei-/
[180] Vilija Kontrimė. Ibid.
[181] Kucharevič, Ivona. "Vargas dėl pavardės." *15min.lt*, 19 Oct. 2008, https://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/lietuva/vargas-del-pavardes-56-10686

husband in the role of a king. Robnett et al. (2017) have argued that the pressure that men feel - both internally and externally - to align with the norms of masculinity may be strongly contributing to the continuous endorsement of the traditional marital naming (69). One of the ways this external pressure is expressed is that non-traditional naming choices of women are seen as a reflection of a man who is "less instrumental, more expressive, and as holding less power in the relationship" (Robnett et al. 2017: 69). A telling example of how this popular allegory operates as a form of symbolic violence was depicted by one of the participants: "when, half an hour before the wedding ceremony, my father found out the wife of my brother is choosing a non-suffixed surname, he said she is choosing to be a wife of an idiot" [a10]. References to this particular allegory also appear in my data:

> Of course, there were people who told me: you choose to be an idiot instead of the queen… [e16]

The tendency of Lithuanian men to degrade the new surname has also been observed in the study of Rita Miliūnaitė, who has analyzed internet comments in relation to the public backlash against the *-ė* surname in the year 2009. Ignoring the gendered nature of the phenomenon, she concludes: "I observed quite a paradox - it is common in our society to see women in the role of those who take care of the language, its heritage, protection and transmission to the children starting from the cradle. [My study] has shown that it was mostly men who were protecting this language tradition, traditional language system and traditional family names"[182]. She also shares a few examples of how this protection of the language was manifested in internet comments: "if I had to choose between the two [female] doctors, I would always go to the one who has the traditional family name". Moreover, some men would not accept if their children were taught by a woman with an *-ė* surname[183]. Some of the respondents in my study also provide meta knowledge about men's attitudes towards the *-ė* surname:

> I know of men who did not/would not let their wives keep their own or choose the *neutral* surname. [e4]

[182] Smolskienė, Lina. "Kalbininkė: už tradicines moterų pavardes mūru stojo vyrai." *Ryto allegro,* 8 Feb. 2015, www.lrt.lt/naujienos/lietuvoje/2/92346/kalbininke-uz-tradicines-moteru-pavardes-muru-stojo-vyrai
[183] Ibid.

> "There are many men who believe that a woman has to change her surname into theirs - there are a few couples among my friends who had a serious fight over this issue"[184]

> I met a number of women who said they - too - wanted to keep their birth surname or take the one with an ending *-ė*, but their husband would not let them [c7]

> "When one changes one's name or surname, also one's destiny changes. When I was getting married, I wanted to keep my maiden surname Naciūtė because I am not fascinated by the traditional suffix *-ienė* of married women. Unfortunately, when we went to apply for the marriage, the blackmail began. My husband told me: You do not love me!"[185]

In their analysis of self-naming practices of contemporary Israeli women, Rom and Benjamin observe that changing patterns of contemporary masculinity tend to fracture it into separate and, often, conflicting domains, where the private sphere provides men with the possibility to "cooperate with their wives' expectations for progressive marriage" (2011: 170). The public circles, however, expects them to (re)produce traditional masculinity, "primarily based on the principle of not being controlled by women" (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 170). More often than not, those expectations to reproduce traditional masculinity by "maintaining their patronymic privileges" are enforced within their familial circles (Rom and Benjamin 2011). The notion that patronymic surnames are perceived as a sort of familial property that men are expected to protect are expressed within the narratives of the participants of my study:

> My [then] husband absolutely did not object [my choice of the surname], but when he went to the sauna with his friends and they all discussed what has your wife done, he came back with an attitude that he has permitted/allowed me too much [f1]

> The boss of my husband was shocked to find out about my surname and he has given [my husband] a long lecture on how he should have not allowed me to distort his surname. [d5]

---

[184] Digrytė, Eglė. "Lietuvos moterys neutralias pavardes renkasi retai, bet dažniausiai - visam laikui." *Delfi.lt,* 4 Nov. 2006, www.delfi.lt/gyvenimas/istorijos/lietuvos-moterys-neutralias-pavardes-renkasi-retai-bet-dazniausiai-visam-laikui.d?id=8940936 [accessed 18.11.13]

[185] Angelina Zalatorienė in Vozbutaitė, Jolanta. "Kokią pavardę renkasi ištekėjusios moterys?" *Moteris.lt,* 11 May 2009, www.moteris.lt/psichologija/kokia-pavarde-renkasi-istekejusios-moterys.d?id=59664265 [accessed 19.11.2013]

> My husband did not object to my choice and did not really care about it. But his side of the family commented on my choice saying that I turned their surname into a ridicule, I distorted their family name and that they would have never let me take that kind of surname. [f12]

One of the most informative testimonies of the role of the family circles in the process of womens' self-naming was described by one of the participants of my study. As she was (secretly from her husband) applying for a passport with her new hyphenated surname, the Civil Registry Officer hinted at her presumed naivety:

> When I went to apply for a new passport due to my new surname, a woman who worked there looked at my surname choice and told me: "You will come back. You all do." [d5]

One could argue this testimony provides important meta knowledge about an illegible number of women who would have preferred to choose the new surname, but have returned back to the registry office to fix their passports by obtaining the right (traditional) family name. In fact, that same woman describes her husband's reaction to her new surname after seeing her newly issued passport:

> My husband was so furious about my new surname he did not speak to me for a week and then told me we need to divorce. Luckily, both mine and his family supported me and he softened, but I know he is still hoping I will change my surname into a *normal* one [d5]

Family pressure

However, again and again, women's narratives of self-naming reveal that most of the pressure and criticism regarding the new family name has come from the members of the husband's family:

> We've been married for seven already, but I still have unpleasant feelings remembering how the family of my husband had forbidden me to take the surname with the ending *-ė*. I understand they did not "hold my hand" when I was putting the signature, but when, with just a few days left until the

> wedding, my father-in-law said that he will not attend the wedding if I do not take *-ienė*… It makes me sick… At the moment, both me and my husband were in shock, I took *-ienė* surname[186]

Less commonly, but still in big numbers, they also reveal having received criticism from their own parents and grandparents. As most of the participants of this group have obtained their husband's surname, but skipped the traditional suffix *-ienė-*, the criticism, they report, is mostly associated with the distorted and mutilated family name.

> Only after the marriage I found out that the family of my husband thought my choice [of the surname] was strange, unusual. They perceived me as a careerist, I guess this is how they explained my choice to themselves. [d4]

> I guess my in-laws have not put up [my marital surname] and my mother-in-law keeps calling me *-ienė*. [...] Ten years ago they told me I have distorted their family, that it is a nuisance and that I was just showing caprice. [e7]

> The parents and grandparents of my husband were shocked by my decision, for the 10 remaining years of my marriage they were reproaching me for mutilating *their* surname. [...] They were very pleased when the second wife of my husband took the traditional surname after marriage. [f1]

It could be argued that a common dissatisfaction of the husband's family with a woman's use of a non-suffixed family name comes from the fact that, within most communities of practice with well established patrilineal naming traditions, marital name change also refers to, albeit symbolic, transition to patrilocality - a figurative change of a tribe. While, in the Lithuanian language, this symbolic belonging is so clearly expressed through the appropriation of traditional suffixes, refusing them also means disturbing the discursive order in which subjects are made intelligible through certain linguistic and social practices. These new illegible feminine identities seem to be challenging existing familial power positions by establishing new domains of ambivalent belonging (Rom and Benjamin 2011) in which women's dependency on their husbands for the production of appropriate femininity (Cancian in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 93) is disturbed. On the other hand, as these testimonies demonstrate, husbands' family names are perceived as familial assets

[186] Joana. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

(Rom and Benjamin 2011: 145) that women are only authorized to use, but they are not perceived as their personal property[187]. Unsurprisingly, then, narratives of Lithuanian women with non-traditional surnames also reveal that their choice of the new surname was often a compromise that takes into account personal, social, and familial expectations.

Dilemmas and compromises

One of the most talked about women in relation to her non-traditional naming choices is a Lithuanian journalist Aurelija Simutis who has obtained her husband's surname upon marriage, including an ending that indicates a grammatical male gender. As she got married in 1999, the law allowing women to take a non-suffixed surname did not yet exist. Neither was it possible to obtain a husband's surname in its *male* version[188]. However, she managed to find gaps in (then) existing regulation and has since been known as one of a very few publicly visible women who possesses a surname identical to that of her husband[189]. When talking about her choice within the Lithuanian media, she explained it as a compromise between her and her future husband who would not accept the fact that she was not willing to give up her birth surname upon marriage. Having come from a family in which women had traditionally kept their own surname, she only accepted taking his surname under the condition that she would not need to obtain the suffix *-ienė-*[190].

The notion of the non-suffixed surname as a compromise that navigates between individual preferences and established codes of practice (Adams in Thwaites 2017b) is also found in accounts of women with the non-suffixed surname:

> "Woman reveals she had considered keeping only her maiden surname after marriage, but after having found out that the choice of her surname is very important to her husband, she found a compromise -

[187] The most descriptive example of this approach can be observed in cases when men demand that their wives *return* their surname after divorce.
[188] According to existing Lithuanian law, women who marry Lithuanian citizens, ought to choose between three available options that all indicate a grammatical female gender. Women who have the surname of their husband with its male ending *-as, -is or -us* have married men who are either not citizens of Lithuania (famous examples are Izolda Gudelis) or are themselves citizens of other states (like a famous entrepreneur Daina Bosas);
[189] A form of a family name that - as I discuss later - a growing number of women would prefer to have for a number of reasons;
[190] Evelina, Uždavinytė. "Lietuvos moterų vargai dėl pavardės." *Tiesa,* 3 Apr. 2010, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/emigrants/lietuvos-moteru-vargai-del-pavardes.d?id=30709499 [accessed 15 Sept 2014]

> she chose the non-suffixed version of his family name [...] I decided to keep my maiden surname and add Dirmė after hyphen. I chose this version because it is shorter than Dirmienė"[191]
>
> My husband had always supported me and I guess he would have only objected if I did not take his surname at all [f13]
>
> If the new [non-suffixed] option had not appeared, I would have kept my maiden surname only [d4]

Just like for the earlier mentioned respondent [d5], for some women with the non-suffixed surname, the process of choosing their marital surname meant a difficult rite of passage where the change of the name is perceived as conflicting with their subjectivity:

> When choosing the [marital] surname, I was really lost and considered all the possible options [...] I have first filed for the [traditional] surname, but I changed my mind a day before the wedding and went again [to the Civil Registry Office] to change my application to have a double surname [d3]
>
> I first chose the surname of my husband, the classic option [with ending *-ienė*]. I had many doubts [...] I talked to many people and half recommended the one option and the other half - the other [*-ė*]. So I stayed with the classic one. Then [after the marriage], while I was waiting for my new passport I was even dreaming during the night that I chose an ugly surname and that I should have chosen the shorter [one]. So [I changed my surname into the short one] - on the day that I had to pick up my new passport I applied for a new one with a shorter surname this time. [e6]

To sum up, besides the already discussed generally negative attitudes towards the new surname due to its *violation* of the Lithuanian language heritage, narratives of women with non-traditional family names reveal that their marital identities are often perceived as a site of tension that also challenge the discursive order established within their social and familial communities of practice. Often, the family of the husband sees the rejection of the traditional suffix as an arrogant mutilation of their property - their family name. These naming choices are also perceived as a sign of weakness of the masculinity of their spouses who, in turn, pressure their future spouses to follow traditional naming habits[192]. Women also say they are

[191] Diana Gaičiūnaitė-Dirmė in Dovidavičienė, Snieguolė. "*Nenorėjau būti '-ienė'*." Lietuvos Rytas, 12 May 2009, www.gyvbudas.lrytas.lt/seima/2009/05/12/news/nenorejau-buti--iene--5805417/ [accessed 1 Nov. 2013]

[192] While studies like that of Rom and Benjamin (2011) have outlined a number of reasons why men pressure their wives into following the traditional patrilineal pattern, studies of non-traditional self-naming practices in contemporary Lithuania would benefit from an investigation into 'marital negotiation' (Rom and Benjamin 2011).

often ridiculed and lectured by public clerks at banks, health and education institutions. However, regardless of the documented negativity towards their naming practices, respondents of my study generally reject any influence of others on their choice, arguing that it was 100 percent their decision to opt for a particular version of the non-suffixed surname.

Hiding injuries

Given the earlier discussed negative atmosphere towards the new surname due to its symbolic mutilation of the traditional surname, it is quite surprising how Lithuanian women downplay negative experiences and construct subjectivities that seem to be unaffected by any social tensions related to the surname problem. Refusing "the reductive language of victims" (Oksala 2011: 113), when asked about the role of their husbands and other members of the family in making their naming choices, they fiercely reject the subject position of an '"appropriate femininity [...] of passive obedience or emotional self-recruitment for the task of pleasing husbands" (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 98). Instead through an employment of choice narrative, they perform individualized and empowered femininity (Budgeon 2015) or, following Gill, produce postfeminist subjectivities embedded in psychologized confidence regime (Gill 2017), built on the injunction of the neoliberal logic to deny external injury (Favaro 2019: 16). Importantly for my further discussions, women with an *-ė* surname describe the process of decision making as a high-powered individual decision and strongly reject any impact of their husband. Others demonstrate their content in finding out that the surname they have chosen was also their husband's preferred option:

> There weren't many discussions with my husband. I have decided for myself [d4]

> I did not discuss my decision with my husband. I simply told him which version I will choose [e14]

> My husband and his family did not interfere in making this decision. I asked my husband what he would think about me choosing the shorter version of his surname. I feel he might have liked for me to take the traditional surname, but he let me decide for myself, he did not criticize my choice [e17]

> It was purely my own decision and my husband supported it [e5]

> My husband supported my choice [...] And even if he had not - his word would have had no power in relation to this question [d2]

> I have not discussed my choice with anyone [e10]

As it has been argued by Shelly Budgeon (2015), the usefulness of the choice narrative lies in the fact that it enables one to talk about agency without applying the victim paradigm; however, it also needs to be remembered that choice is a "relational and contextual term and does not necessarily lead to equality" (Budgeon in Gregor and Grzebalska 2016: 14). This is particularly relevant in relation to the fact that while, for the most part, respondents of this group defend their naming practices with a celebratory narrative of individual choice, their actual naming choices do not disturb the *status quo* of the patronymic male privilege (Rom and Benjamin 2011). As they disturb the existing discursive order by choosing new linguistic tools in producing their marital femininities, certain options - such as retaining or neutralizing one's birth surname upon marriage - reside within the symbolic realm of the unthinkingness (Thwaites 2017b). An illustrative example of how the paradigm of choice is still very much related to the habitual re-enactment of patronymic tradition is presented in the account of a man who is about to get married. Due to his ethnic background, his future wife has access to more linguistic options in deciding on her marital surname and he positions himself as a supportive partner who is accepting of any of the choices his spouse would make. Except that the choices he lists as available to his wife do not include her keeping or neutralizing her birth surname:

> "Vladislavas Jeroslavcevas has lived all his life in Lithuania. However, he does not have Lithuanian citizenship. "It just happened that I am a citizen of Russian Federation [...] In my Russian passport my surname is written with Russian characters. [However, in Lithuanian documents] my surname is written 'Yaroslavtsev'. It has not caused me much problems. Yet, I am about to get married so my future wife has to choose which surname she will have in her new passport: Yaroslavtseva, Jeroslavceva, Jeroslavcevienė, or maybe Jeroslavcevė? [...] It is her choice and I will support whichever decision she makes"[193]

[193]Kucharevič, Ivona. "Vargas dėl pavardės." *15min.lt*, 19 Oct. 2008, https://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/lietuva/vargas-del-pavardes-56-10686

According to ethnographic observations *and* the sample of this study, Lithuanian women with the new surname consistently opt for the family name of their husbands. Consequently, while the reasons they provide will be extensively discussed in the later parts of this chapter, I would argue that their naming choice could be seen as non-traditional only in relation to the linguistic/symbolic dimension of this gendered phenomenon.

Traditional approach to naming

While within the paradigm of late modernity life choices are perceived as separated from rigid traditions of the past (Giddens 1996), critics of choice feminism argue that individualisation theorists have oversimplified the role of the past in establishing different codes of practice (Matthew Adams 2003) that structure and inform our personal lives (Thwaites 2017b: 64). Codes of practices form traditions that guide our decisions and "can become so embedded that they are unthought" (Thwaites 2017b: 64). Thwaites has argued that naming practices of women challenge the Giddenian notion of the modern self as unrestrained by rigid traditional rules and free to construct their identities through numerous choices and options unavailable for previous generations: "[t]he choice narrative ignores not only the very important place of unthinkingness within norms and traditions, but also that some seemingly freely made decisions are so influenced by societal practice and opinion that they cannot be considered truly free, in Gidden's sense" (Thwaites 2017b: 64).

A telling example of how much heteronormative marital femininity is perceived as inevitably aligned with traditional naming practices can be found in a narrative of one of the respondents of my study [e6]. As she delivers an extensive description of the sense of indecisiveness she has experienced before the marriage about which version of the marital surname should be chosen and talks about recurring dreams regarding the "ugliness" of her new surname, I ask her if she had considered keeping her birth surname upon marriage. "It did not even cross my mind," she says [e6][194].

[194] What is even more striking in her naming story is that her birth surname - being of a Slavic origin - does not have the *suffix problem*. Common to Slavic female surnames, it has an ending that indicates the grammatical gender. But it does not automatically reveal the marital status of a woman. Here one could also go back to the case study of Natalija Bunkė (ex Zvonkė, ex Ivanova) who - having a non-suffixed birth surname - obtained 'Lithuanian' surnames of her previous husbands and, consequently, had to deal with the 'suffix problem' in each of her marriages.

As part of the pervasive neoliberal rhetoric, an idea that a woman is free to opt for choices that make her feel good pertains to the paradigm of the personal choice (Thwaites 2017b: 64). However, certain choices are so ingrained in situated social norms that "conceiving of other possibilities for action is practically impossible" (Lukes in Thwaites 2017b: 64):

> There were no other options - I knew from the very beginning; if he will be my husband, I will be [xxx]-*ė* [d1]

> I first mentioned the short surname when I jokingly said I would be [xxx]-*ė* just like Zvonkė. Then, after being together for a few years, the wedding day arrived and I was sure my surname will be [xxx]-*ė* [f12]

Consequently, when responding to the question *why* they have chosen this particular version of the marital surname, respondents of my study with a surname ending *-ė* systematically shift their answers to the symbolic aspects of the surname problem, often overlooking the ideological inequalities and patronymic male privilege (Rom and Benjamin 2011) embedded in female naming traditions. Often, following the paradigm of familism generally affiliated with the normative discourse of traditional marital self-naming (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 32; also Clarke et al. 2008), taking the surname of their husband is seen as a sign of respect and loyalty to their spouse:

> As a man and a woman are becoming one family [...], they need to be called by the same surname. [...] To me, it is a sign of respect to your future husband; so that by agreeing to marry him you also agree to take his family name [e14]

> I considered keeping my birth surname, but by agreeing to share my life with the husband I wanted to accept his surname [e12]

As I have demonstrated, narratives of Lithuanian women who have opted for different versions of marital names reveal "shared cultural assumptions about names" (Clarke et al. 2008: 435). Lithuanian women who choose family names with an ending *-ienė*, decide on a hyphenated surname with two traditional surnames *and* those who obtain the non-suffixed version of a marital surname with an ending *-ė* tend to follow a traditional approach to naming in that they see women's naming practices as central to doing/being family (Clarke

et al. 2008) and, consequently, as Thwaites has put it, gendering social identity (2017a). Following this line, the surname keepers - women who have decided on keeping their maiden surnames with traditional suffixes *-aitė, -ytė, -utė* after marriage - could be seen as expressing non-traditional attitude towards marital naming as they do not seem to support the functional fixedness (Pilcher 2017) in relation to marital name change as an important part of marital or feminine identity. According to my data, this practice is the least popular among the married women interviewed in this study. Undoubtedly, one of the reasons for its low popularity among the Lithuanian women is due to the stereotypes attached to an image of a single (unmarried) woman *and* its linguistic affiliations with immaturity and girlihood. However, most of the women who decided to keep their surname upon marriage also have a background in creative industries, making it easier to justify their choice due to the social acceptability of the fact that they have done so to protect their cultural capital or cultural loading (Rom and Benjamin 2011) attached to their family name. While the introduction of the new surname makes it possible for women to shorten their "maiden" surname, I have only come across three women[195] who decided to eliminate the diminutive suffix from their family name and this choice was not related to any critical transitions (Pilcher 2017) such as marriage or divorce. Consequently, both my data and the women I have talked to confirm that - to this day - the new surname *-ė* is perceived as a surname signifying marital femininities. Consequently, as apparent in accounts by Lithuanian women who opted for non-traditional marital surnames, while the idea of (consumer's) right to choose (Craven in Thwaites 2017b: 64) is celebrated, their main preoccupation was whether or not to add the traditional suffix next to their husband's surname. Rather than ideological inequalities ingrained within traditional Lithuanian naming practices, the traditional suffix *-ienė* should, thus, be seen as a core element of contention that dominates the discourse.

Conclusion on choice

While the wide-spread mobilization of the notion of personal choice within various socio-political terrains makes it an easily digestible concept in media terms (Hussein in Phipps 2014: 64), according to Rosalind Gill, choices cannot be understood as "arrived at autonomously" for our preferences have everything to do with our daily contact with our cultural habitat (2007: 73). Moreover, as Phipps has observed, the mobilization of the choice

[195] All from the "Feminist sample".

narrative by different - and often conflicting - political agendas underlines the fact that, in many cases, the concept is a meaningless one as "it tends to erase other rationales and motivations, and glosses over complexities" (Hussein in Phipps 2014: 64). Consequently, the lack of attention to its social situatedness strips it from its context and leaves "the process of deciding in itself seen as empowering" (Meyers in Phipps 2014: ch. 1).

In analysing naming practices in contemporary United Kingdom, Thwaites has argued that "[n]aming decisions are particularly open to choice [...] rhetorics" (2017b: 62). As she looks into testimonies of feminists who have taken the surname of their husband upon marriage, she finds that choice narrative is used as a narrative that justifies their seemingly non-feminist action and makes their decision more intelligible within their feminist community (Thwaites 2017b: 63). Conversely, as a discursive resource that "provides women with a sense of empowerment and agency" (Thwaites 2017b: 63), the repertoire of choice is employed by the Lithuanian women who have obtained non-traditional surnames as a way to fix ideological dilemmas that arise in relation to their non-traditional decisions over their marital surname. Given the intensity of cultural loading (Rom and Benjamin 2011) assigned to the traditional female surnames, the narrative of choice relocates naming practices into the seemingly neutral subjective domain of an individual choice, both distancing the subject from any political engagement and maintaining the sense of individual agency. Consequently, the repudiation of the culturally overburdened (Gill 2007) traditional suffix *-ienė* is made intelligible through the neoliberal paradigm of the personal choice as a way to reconstruct a "socially recognized identity" (Oksala 2011: 107).

Thwaites has conducted a qualitative study investigating how women (in the UK) who perceive themselves to be feminists justify their decision to follow traditional naming practices on marriage (2017b). Her research is based on a (rhetorical) question: "Making a choice or taking a stand?" (Thwaites 2017b). One could argue that this is a productive question to ask in my further inquiry into the narratives of women who have obtained the feminist form of a marital surname after marriage. As I have discussed so far, women with an *-ė* surname do not aim to challenge ideological aspects of traditional marital naming. However, their naming practices are non-traditional in their linguistic use - or their refusal - of the suffix that reveals a marital status of a woman. As I discuss later, their engagement

with the issue is located at the symbolic level of naming practices.

As I have discussed in Part II of this thesis, discussions of the suffix problem in Lithuanian traditional female surnames sporadically appeared a few times since the beginning of the independence movement at the end of the 19th century and were mostly related to the question of social respectability of unmarried women and the burden of traditional suffixes *-aitė*, *-ytė*, *-utė* as signifiers of those femininities. An inquiry into the narratives of naming by contemporary Lithuanian women - as well as relevant public discussions - reveals a dramatic paradigmatic shift in how the suffix problem is constructed due to its overwhelming preoccupation with symbolic renegotiation of female marital identities. Furthermore, as I argue in the next part of this chapter, the distancing from traditional embodiments of marital identities can be understood at the development of global femininities, imbued by postfeminist rationality. A rationality that is in part made intelligible via the discursive paradigm of aesthetic preference.

The Aesthetics Paradigm

Time and again, respondents of my study explain their choice of non-traditional family name as a decision motivated by the aesthetic qualities of the new surname:

> I will not deny that the subjective *beauty* of the surname was one of the arguments [f10]
>
> I simply chose based on the beauty of the surname [e14]
>
> This form of the surname is simply much more beautiful, lighter than the suffixed one [e7]
>
> [In case of a second marriage] I would keep my current one and maybe I would take that of the husband. But only if he had a beautiful surname [f9]

Clarke et al. (2008) have argued that while most of the justifications delivered in naming accounts[196] support the ideological and symbolic significance of naming practices, "talk about the aesthetics of names firmly individualizes naming practices, decontextualizing these practices and divesting them of any political or ideological significance" (2008: 435).

[196] Both by heterosexual women and by individuals who are in homosexual partnerships;

In relation to self-naming practices of contemporary Lithuanian women, one could argue that, given the contentious cultural loading (Rom and Benjamin 2011) of the traditional surname, both the choice paradigm *and* a list of discursive repertoires that I see as belonging to the paradigm of the aesthetic preference could also be read as discursive strategies that women employ in order to depoliticize their self-naming practices and, consequently, to re-establish the intelligibility of their non-traditional feminine identities within their communities of practice. Importantly, while these discursive frameworks could be seen as certain rhetorical alternatives to the dominant perception of the new surname as 1) supporting feminist ideology, 2) disturbing the production of hegemonic appropriate femininity (Cancian in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 93) and 3) destroying the preservation of ethno-cultural heritage, I contend that neoliberal rationality or, more precisely, gendered neoliberalism (Gill 2017) is employed in women's narratives of self-naming as the new framework of intelligibility (Butler 1990) in their performative stories of self-naming. Neoliberal individualism, as McAvoy has argued, is one of the dominant contemporary knowledge/practice regimes of Western societies (McAvoy 2015: 25), and scholars of postsocialism have extensively discussed the effects of neoliberal rationality on postsocialist gender formations (Asztalos Morell and Gradskova 2018). Consequently, against the backdrop of the body of work established by theorists of postfeminist culture, I argue that elements of gendered neoliberalism (Gill 2017) that can be observed as informing new feminine subjectivities in women's narratives of self-naming, provides critical access to the political content of situated self-naming stories and, thus, challenge the notion that the shift of attention to the aesthetic dimension of the name deprives naming narratives of "any political or ideological significance" (Clarke et al. 2008: 435).

While listing the reasons why she has obtained the non-suffixed family name after the marriage, one of my respondents says:

> The most important criteria while choosing the surname was the sound and how it fitted with my forename. If I can choose my surname (my name was chosen by my parents, I inherited my surname from my father), then I can also choose the version that sounds the nicest to me. So my motives regarding the suffix were not based on any political, cultural or women's rights criteria. Just the sound and emotion. I wanted for the whole family to share the same surname. And - most importantly - to have the surname of my husband, but with an ending that shows female grammatical gender. One

more thing - I did not want to share my surname with the wife of my brother-in-law [...] whom I did not like [e18].

Constructed around the repertoire of individual choice *and* the one of aesthetic preferences, this narrative argues against any political agenda behind naming practices. As she demonstrates her awareness of the possibility that her choice of the surname could be understood as supporting feminist agenda, this respondent positions her naming choice within the individualizing domain of taste and emotions. However, this seemingly depolitized account also constructs a list of *others*. First, she performatively distances her social identity from feminist identities. Importantly, (and similarly to a vast majority of self-naming narratives[197] in my data) the aesthetic appeal of the traditionally suffixed family name is seen as *affected* by the presence of other feminine identities belonging to her husband's kinship. Moreover, while the narrative of choice is used as an empowering discourse of independence and agency, a possibility of not changing the surname upon marriage is discarded, thus, objectively leaving just two options to choose from - that of the traditional suffixed *-ienė* and the non-suffixed with an ending *-ė*. Consequently, following the consumerist logic of the right to choose, the celebration of individual choice can be seen as a celebration of "the process of deciding in itself" (Meyers in Phipps 2014: ch. 1).

Contemporary scholars of naming argue that naming traditions are central to the social formation of gender (Robnett 2017: 823; also Pilcher 2017; Pilcher 2016). Therefore, doing naming differently also means "doing gender differently" (Robnett 2017: 824), and my aim in this part of this chapter is to critically inquire into the rationale of respondents who have chosen the non-suffixed version of their marital name. As it has been discussed in Part II, as a study of narratives of self-naming by contemporary Lithuanian women, this thesis is first and foremost a study of language and gender. Recently, feminist linguistic scholars have been calling for new forms of analysis that would reinvigorate the field with analytical activism (Lazar 2007) in order to better explore fluctuating representations of feminism and femininity (Lazar in Litosseliti et al. 2019: 1). Consequently, they argue that - next to their "sustained attention to language" - critical engagement with postfeminism is constructive in making connections to "broader cultural patterns, and ultimately better understand [how]

[197] Of the women with an *-ė* surname;

complex phenomena [...] have depoliticizing effects" (Litosseliti et al. 2019). Using the work of scholars of postfeminist sensibility as a transnational cultural phenomenon imbued with individualistic market rationality, I read women's narratives of non-traditional naming using postfeminism as an analytic category (Litosseliti et al. 2019) in order to critically engage with their discursive constructions.

The above mentioned account is a typical example of most of the self-naming narratives in that it engages with two or more interpretative repertoires in constructing a naming story. In what follows, I outline a list of repertoires that I see as belonging to the aesthetic paradigm and provide only the relevant segments from the whole narrative of various participants. However, this is not to suggest that respondents of my study only provide singled out reasons in narrating their stories of naming - they are usually enmeshed into a complex sense-making where two, three or more different reasons are provided. However, as they are grouped differently in each narrative, there is a list of consistent repertoires that I present in my further analysis. Therefore, as I proceed with my analysis, I present more extended excerpts from different narratives. To sum up, the further explication of the most common discursive repertoires that show up in women's narratives of naming presents a gradual analysis that later delivers a wider overview of the social phenomena that can be observed from these narratives.

Phonetics and semantics

Both within the media and private interviews, Lithuanian women who have obtained the non-suffixed family name after marriage refer to the aesthetic and qualities of the *sound* or *sonorousness* of the new surname as the principal reason behind their choice. Referring to the phonetic and semantic characteristics of the chosen surname, women repeatedly argue that the main reason why they have chosen this form of the marital name was that the non-suffixed surname just sounded nicer. Importantly, surveys carried out by various news outlets also confirm that even though women of younger generations are more supportive of the new surname, its aesthetic qualities play a crucial role in whether they would choose the new form of the surname[198]

[198] Taškūnaitė, Julija. "Neutralios moterų pavardės - atsiskyrimas nuo santuokos?" *Lietuvos žinios,* 21 Oct 2013, www.lzinios.lt/lzinios/print.php?idas=165770 [accessed 1 Nov. 2013]

My decision making process was quite simple. I chose the short version of the surname first and foremost due to its sonorousness [...] It was not my goal to have a surname with an ending *-ė* [e17]

I was just waiting for the most beautifully sounding version to land into my head [e9]

I have remarried and kept my [Slavic] maiden surname. If I had to decide now, it would be very difficult because the surname of my [current] husband is rather interesting. I would not know which version sounds better. [e6]

Some surnames sound better with an ending *-ė* and some - with *-ienė* [ė4]

Women simply choose what sounds better to them at the time [f6]

I would have kept my birth surname if the surname of my husband had been a meaningless hulk [e13]

In many cases, the aesthetic qualities of the marital surname are evaluated by how it sounds together with the respondent's first name. Often, due to the fact that many Lithuanian female first names end with a vowel *-ė,* adding a non-suffixed surname with an ending *-ė* often creates a personal name that produces an effect of alliteration:

"I chose this surname because there is a possibility to choose. Plus, Viržintė sounds better than Viržintienė next to my first name [Indrė]. By doing this, I did not distant myself from my husband, I did give up my maiden surname on marriage"[199]

The most important criteria while choosing the surname was the sound and how it fitted with my forename. [e18]

I liked the way it sounded with my first name [e15]

The traditional version did not sound nice with my first name [e12]

I simply chose based on the beauty of the surname. The shorter version just fitted so perfectly with my first name. Both my name and my [current] surname are short and contain many vowels *-e* and *-ė*. [e14]

[199] Indrė Viržintė. Dovidavičienė, Snieguolė. "*Nenorėjau būti -ienė.*" Lietuvos Rytas, 12 May 2009, www.gyvbudas.lrytas.lt/seima/2009/05/12/news/nenorejau-buti--iene--5805417/ [accessed 1 Nov. 2013]

Next to the phonetic ones, respondents of my study also refer to the semantic qualities of the husband's surname that - in some cases - are seen as perfectly reflecting the bodily and personal characteristics of the interviewee:

> In my case, the beautiful sounding and the [semantic] meaning[200] of the surname when adding an ending *-ė* was the decisive factor. [...] So the main motif - the meaning of the surname (I myself am a tiny person) and the sounding of it. [e3]

> Knowing me, it was obvious I will take the non-suffixed form [e15]

> I chose the short version first and foremost because of its sound. I have quite an extrovert personality so I wanted a strong surname that would reflect that. The short version [of my husband's surname] to me sounds stronger and more categorical [e17]

Following recent scholarship on practices of naming, names embody and engender (Pilcher 2017). Therefore, in Part I of this thesis, I have argued for the importance of integrating a corporal dimension within naming practices and have established the idea that surnames (just like other objects and commodities), while related to a specific body, serve as one of symbolic acts of consumption that contribute in constructing a personal story about one's social identity (Seale 2004). Consequently, as the above mentioned performative accounts of women who have obtained the non-suffixed surname demonstrate, the new marital surnames are perceived as holding the capacity to produce embodied named identities (Pilcher 2017) as they are perceived as capable to express certain personal or bodily traits. So much so that they could be seen as an asset in constructing individualized or - branded - identities, embedded in what Sarah Banet-Weiser (2012), Akane Kanai (2015) or Alison Winch (2015) have described as the authentic self-brand culture. In fact, the sentiment that the new surname is seen as a way to construe distinctive individualized femininities that often serve as a brand of a person does come up within my data:

> The non-suffixed surnames gives a sense of individuality [e13]

> When I present myself with this surname, I feel unique and exceptional [e3]

[200] Semantically, the surname describes a short, tiny person;

> People say that this surname suits me as I am a photographer [d1]

Confirming the individualizing brand-like nature of the short surname, some women claim that the new surname serves them as their new first name or a nickname as most of the people from theirs social circles address them by their non-suffixed surnames:

> Only my sister, my childhood friends and my father address me by my first name. It [the surname] has effectively become my second name and most people call me by my surname. It has become part of my selfhood and I would not be able to change it [f1]

Therefore, following Clarke et al., one could argue that the aesthetic repertoire of sound could be understood as one of the strategies in constructing individualized social identities, not invested in political or ideological frameworks (Clarke et al. 2008). However, following the work of scholars of postfeminist sensibility, I argue that these - and subsequent - discursive repertoires presented by the participants of my study are embedded within the postfeminist sensibility and its celebration of women's body "both as the locus of womanhood and the key site of women's value" (Elias et al. 2017: 25).

I have already discussed that the aesthetic labor (Elias et al. 2017) holds a special place within the postfeminist culture. Framed as freely chosen acts of complacency (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4), numerous beautification practices promote the heterosexual youthful beauty as a way to attain and demonstrate cultural capital (Winch in Elias et al. 2017: 4). Interestingly, discursive constructions that belong to the paradigm of aesthetic preference do reveal women's inclination to construct youthful marital femininities. Moreover, as my further analysis reveals, these youthful beauties (Winch 2015) are discursively contrasted with various embodiments of old-fashioned, ageing femininities, associated with the traditional suffix *-ienė*. Consequently, as practices of embodiment, self-naming practices of contemporary Lithuanian women could be understood as powerful speech acts of self-branding, which is closely intertwined with postfeminist desire to embody heteronormative desirability (McRobbie in Elias et al. 2017) of marital femininities that, as I demonstrate in my further analysis, are seen as a site of discursive struggle.

Youthful marital femininities

As it has been mentioned earlier, the majority of (married) women who have opted for the non-suffixed family name have chosen the surname of their husband. However, they have chosen not to add the traditional suffix to it. Often, one of the reasons they list in their accounts is that they felt too young to carry the traditional form of their marital surname:

> Honestly, I did not even consider becoming *-ienė*. I was 25 [years old] when I got married. It felt that I will become old with this surname [e7]
>
> I got married at 25 [years old-], maybe unconsciously I felt too young for *-ienė*. [e3]
>
> "I married in 1999 at the age of twenty. I really did not want to become *-ienė* at such an age"[201]
>
> This *-ienė* ending seriously ages you. I would take *-ė* if I really had to [c8]
>
> We were so young when we got married, and *-einė* had associations with aunties[202]

Interestingly, due to certain linguistic particularities, some of the non-suffixed surnames read just like another female maiden surname - a quality that provides a curious interplay between heteronormative marital sexualities *and* youthful femininities. For example, some women who marry men with a family name that - due to their patronymic origins - possesses certain diminutive suffixes (like *-ait-, -ut-, -yt-, -el-*), choose not to add traditional marital suffixes and opt for the non-suffixed ending thus constructing a pleasantly sounding[203] surname, culturally associated with that of a young girl. As I cannot reveal the real names of my respondents to provide concrete examples, there are few public figures who have obtained such a surname: Justina Jarutė, Greta Akcijonaitė, Jurgita Jurkutė-Širvaitė[204]. In fact, one of them was interviewed by the Lithuanian media regarding her new surname:

---

[201] Aurelija Simutis. Evelina, Uždavinytė. "Lietuvos moterų vargai dėl pavardės." *Tiesa,* 3 Apr. 2010, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/emigrants/lietuvos-moteru-vargai-del-pavardes.d?id=30709499 [accessed 15 Sept 2014]

[202] Agnė. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

[203] Quoting the authors of the Petition to the Lithuanian Parliament.

[204] Justina Jarutė (husband Jarutis) instead of Jarutienė; Greta Akcijonaitė (husband Akcijonaitis) instead of Akcijonaitienė; Jurgita Jurkutė-Širvaitė instead (husband Širvaitis) Širvaitienė;

> "It would be very difficult to live with a long surname Akcijonaitienė. I travel abroad a lot, foreigners would have problems pronouncing it. To be honest, *-ienė* scared me a little; even though I was not afraid of the status of a married woman inscribed into my surname. However, it is hard to get used to this *-ienė* in your passport that shows up overnight, so I wrote down all the options on a piece of paper and I found Akcijonaitė to be the most acceptable [...] I did have to explain a few times at banks and health institutions why I have swapped one maiden surname with the other"[205]
>
> Also, the presence of the diminutive suffix *-el-*[206] [within husband's surname] creates a beautifully sounding diminutive surname that makes it sound very Lithuanian and has pleasant connotations[207]. [e14]

Feminist scholars of media and communication have investigated postfeminist endoresment of youthful disposition (Lazar 2017: 65) and the way it serves as a tool of self-branding as well as "the means by which women acquire and display their cultural capital" (Winch 2015). Importantly, not only are practices of beautification transcoded as a fun pursuit of playful pleasure (Lazar in Lazar 2017), but also - following Lazar's analysis of the register of play in the language of cosmetic's advertising - intentional linguistic/semiotic creativity and originality can be employed as a form of symbolic entrepreneurship, where "wordplay, flouting linguistic conventions and the use of irony [...] index a popular, light-hearted postfeminist identity" (Lazar 2017: 61). The above mentioned accounts once again describe the process of marital self-naming as a consumerist shopping for names, heavily concerned with the aesthetic qualities of the surname, where the beauty of the selected family name is affected by its ability to embody youthful and pleasant femininities as well as certain authentic bodily and personal characteristics.

In relation to performative femininities of contemporary Lithuanian women, choosing non-suffixed marital surnames for their alliterative qualities and - in some cases - for the fact that they enable a linguistic play that recreates youthful and girlish identities that also satisfy a postfeminist desire of heteronormative femininities, could therefore be understood as *a* postfeminist re-branding of marital identities. Moreover, Lazar concludes that "youthism and

[205]Greta Akcijonaitė. Vozbutaitė, Jolanta. "Kokią pavardę renkasi ištekėjusios moterys?" *Moteris.lt,* 11 May 2009, www.moteris.lt/psichologija/kokia-pavarde-renkasi-istekejusios-moterys.d?id=59664265 [accessed 19.11.2013]
[206] Within the surname of the husband;
[207] Participant follows with giving examples from the Lithuanian folk tradition to demonstrate the similarity of her new surname with them;

ageism could be viewed as two sides of a coin, where the fixation on youth corresponds with the denigration of ageism" (Lazar 2017: 65). Importantly, performative constructions of youthful marital femininities within the narratives of self-naming repeatedly engage with the repudiation of old-fashioned and dull femininities seen as embodied by the traditional surname with the suffix *-ienė*.

Against the traditional suffix *-ienė*

According to scholars of postfeminist sensibility, postfeminist celebrations of youthism inevitably mean "strategic-commercial mobilisation of fear and anxiety about ageing (Elias et al. 2017: 29). Interestingly, as they talk about embracing the new feminist surname after marriage, Lithuanian women produce a list of what Julia Kristeva has called *abject* (1982) femininities that are represented by old or ageing female bodies:

> Surnames with *-ienė* sound very ugly [f11]
>
> When I think of surname *-ienė,* I see an old fat lady selling vegetables in the market [d1]
>
> [The *-ienė* suffix] is a relic that defines [...] an older woman [f1]
>
> [...] I never wanted to be *-ienė*. I could not imagine myself having this surname because, to me, it had associations with a fifty years old woman. So it kind of ages you and also shows your belonging to someone. [...] Traditionally suffixed surnames did not sound acceptable to me for their associations to retired women [d4]
>
> The surname with traditional suffix *-ienė* sounded so old-fashioned, did not *stick* with me [e17]
>
> When I was still a young child and I did not understand the meaning of traditional surnames, the surnames of adult women with *-ienė* sounded really ugly to me [f6]
>
> The traditional form also sounded strange, turned me into some sort of *auntie*, I really did not like it. [c2]

Scholars of contemporary postfeminist culture have observed that, besides distinctive gendered characteristics constructed via hegemonic discourses of personal choice,

individuality and self-surveillance (Gill 2007), the neoliberal rationality also contributes to the psychosocial dimension of subjectivity production (Gill 2017; Scharff 2015). A discursive investigation into "how discourse becomes internalized in such a way that it activates feelings" (McAvoy 2015: 23) also enhances our perception of affect and subjective experiences of beauty (Coleman and Moreno Figueroa 2010). As the discursive repertoires above demonstrate, besides constructing traditional suffixes *-ienė* as signifiers of abject old, ageing, and fat bodies, these narratives also produce a list of affects that are embedded in postfeminist regime that produces fear and anxiety about ageism (Elias et al. 2017). Imogen Tyler has demonstrated how media representations of the bodily characteristics - weight, hair, clothing - of the *chav mum* mobilises affects like disgust and contempt (in Elias et al. 2017) in constructing working-class women as abject identities oppositional to the rational neoliberal femininity (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008). Similarly, in the Lithuanian narratives of self-naming, contempt and animosity towards traditionally surnamed women are activated through the use of a postfeminist vocabulary of ageism.

The vulgarization of the surname with the suffix *-ienė* - and subsequent reaffirmation of the *new* surname as providing means for symbolic entrepreneurship (Lazar 2017) - is further mobilized through the representation of traditionally surnamed women as embodying dull, domestic femininities, represented by an image of a housewife:

> I have my own company, and the surname *-ienė* associates with a housewife (I have nothing against them) [e10]

There is also a list of language units that have linguistic connotations to the traditionally suffixed surname. Similarly to the earlier mentioned *karalienė* (a queen) that circulates within the Lithuanian speech community as a metaphorical way to celebrate the tradition of Lithuanian female surnames, some food items also possess the ending *-ienė*. Mostly these are homemade dishes made of one single food item. For example, *obuolys-obuolienė* (an apple - an apple sauce); *kiaušinis - kiaušinienė* (an egg - an omelette), *žuvis - žuvienė* (a fish - fish soup), etc. To some women, these parallels present negative associations, as if adding the traditional suffix to their husband's surname presents them with a family name that positions them as a by-product of their husband.

> [The *-ienė* suffix] is a relic that defines patriarchal attitudes, an older woman. Just like *uogienė, obuolienė*[208] [f1]

> Surnames with *-ienė* sound very ugly [...]. Something like *kiaušinis - kiaušinienė*[209] [f11]

> I saw my husband as a partner and never wanted to be a derivative product, like an omelette made from an egg [f6]

> I chose this surname because it is short, Lithuanian, has a clear meaning, easy to remember. And most importantly it is beautiful. [Choosing surname with an ending *-ė*] meant choosing to be called a bird[210], not the soup of. Which would have been the case had I chosen to be *-ienė* [e13]

In relation to the fact that traditionally suffixed surnames are seen as epitomizing old, dull, domestic femininities, associations with the private and domestic domain represented by various home made dishes only enhances the perception of the domesticity of traditionally named married women, graphically described by a popular term *boba*[211], mostly used as a derogatory name to describe old married women[212]:

> When I was growing up, I always thought that only *bobos* have the surname with an ending *-ienė*, and I knew that I do not want to be one [f12]

Ageism is an integral part of contemporary postfeminist culture, clearly manifested by the investments of the beauty and media industry in their attempts to "push back the boundaries of ageing" (Jermyn 2012; also Lazar 2017; Gill 2007). Identifying traditionally suffixed surnames with popular derogatory imaginations of old married women as abject *boba,* contemporary Lithuanian women discursively employ elements of postfeminist sensibility - which celebrates individualized, youthful femininities - as an alternative framework of intelligibility (Butler 1990) in their performance of gendered identities that calibrate (Cairns and Johnston 2015) between structure, culture and agency (Johnson and Johnson 2015), that

[208] Berry jam, apple sauce;
[209] Egg - an omelette;
[210] This respondent has a surname that semantically refers to a proper name of a bird;
[211] *Bóba:* 1. a derogatory term for a married woman; an old woman; granny; 2. In colloquial language - a wife; www.lkz.lt/Visas.asp?zodis=boba&lns=-1&les=-1&id=03071770000
[212] Recently, interesting work has been published by Anna Shadrina on Russian women's engagement and re-negotiation of the term *babushka* - a semantic equivalent of the Lithuanian *boba* (2020)

is - the conventional reiteration of patronymic naming practices *and* discursive (as well as symbolic) reconfigurations of marital femininities. Interestingly, their inclinations towards youthful embodiments of heteronormative gender identities can be seen as symptomatic in relation to various transnational renegotiations of marital or - as it will be discussed later - maternal femininities are undoubtedly affected by what Gill has called the processes of gendered neoliberalism (2017).

The figure of the *mother-in-law*

As it has already been mentioned, the reenactment of patrilineal naming practices still serves as a powerful domain of gender dependency, in which women rely on their husband's family name in their production of appropriate femininity (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 93). An integral part of this process of identity gendering (Thwaites 2017a) is a woman's symbolic transition to patrilocality (Rom and Benjamin 2011). While, as it has been demonstrated, narratives of self-naming by Lithuanian women who exercise traditional patrilineal practices support and, often, take pride in this linguistic transition to the new familial structures of belonging, women who chose non-suffixed family names after marriage describe the prospect of embracing another family name as causing tension and conflict.

To many respondents of my study, the previously discussed old, dull and unappealing femininities associated with the suffix *-ienė* are embodied by concrete individuals - other women of their husband's kin. As one of the participants jokingly said, "the husband betrays his wife straight on the day of the marriage - he is offering his surname, but the wife gets the surname of her mother-in-law" [b2]. As a matter of fact - differently from most patronymic cultures in which family names do not indicate grammatical male or female gender[213] - family names that women and men share after marriage are identical, like *Mrs.* and *Mr. Smith*. In the Lithuanian traditional naming practices, however, the grammatical gender *and* the marital suffix added to the surname of a woman provides a newly married woman with a surname traditionally "carried" by her mother-in-law[214]. In many cases, she also shares this surname with the wives of her brother(s)-in-law.

[213] With an exception of Slavic surnames;
[214] As well as the grandmother of her husband.

In a rare comparative study investigating naming practices of American and Russian women, Boxer and Gritsenko have documented that Russian women feel obliged to obtain the family name of the husband even if they feel ethically or morally foreign to the patrilocal family (2005). Analysts of self-naming of contemporary Israelian women also outline women's conflicting feelings in relation to cultural loading of the new family name, unfamiliar codes of practice, and symbolic grief due to interethnic marriage (Rom and Benjamin 2011). However, narratives of Lithuanian women reveal that, while they do not object to accepting the surname of the husband, they use the non-suffixed surname as a linguistic alternative in order to avoid carrying the same surname as that of their mother-in-law. Consequently, while absent within public media accounts[215], the repertoire that problematizes strong associations with the figure of the mother-in-law repeatedly appears within women's narratives of self naming:

> I [chose surname with an ending] -*ė* because when I hear [the version with the suffix] -*ienė* - I see my mother-in-law in front of my eyes. It also sounds nicer [d2]

> I did not want to be [xxx]-*ienė* because it brought associations with my mother-in-law whom I did not like very much [f12]

> I wanted the surname of my husband, but I really do not like my mother-in-law. I thought I do not want to be like her, I do not want a surname like hers [e16]

> On the other hand, I will not hide that I was happy that my [new] surname was slightly different from that of my mother-in-law. Though it was really not the main reason [e15]

> When I hear [xxx]-*ienė,* I see his mother in front of me. An old woman with a head full of hair rollers [a8]

> The mother of my husband is already a very old woman. I just did not want to be like her [d5]

A repudiation of ageing marital femininities is, thus, strengthened by the presence of concrete individuals who embody a certain type of marital identity that women are contemplating upon as they describe the process of deciding on their marital surname. For

[215] Women who are interviewed about their non-traditional marital names within the Lithuanian media hardly ever mention haven chosen this form of the surname because of its associations with their mother-in-law.

many, the actual presence of their mother-in-law also creates a sense of marital femininity that is *taken* or semantically occupied and, consequently, produces what Pilcher has called contradictory embodiment (Pilcher 2016):

> I really did not want to be [xxx]-*ienė*. To tell you the truth, partly because I did not want to identify so much with the mother of my husband [e9]

> What was the reason for not choosing the traditional surname? Because this is the surname of my mother-in-law. It's like this surname is already 'taken', belonging to another person. I really have nothing against my mother-in-law, she is a fantastic woman, but I wanted a surname 'of my own', one that would identify me. [e14]

Interestingly, for women whose spouse had been already married, the non-suffixed marital surname is also seen as a tool of establishing separate married identities without fully abandoning the heteronormative patronymic tradition:

> I did not want to be [xxx]-*ienė* because my husband was once already married and that woman chose ending -*ienė*. [...] My husband was pleased because I chose HIS[216] surname and had never been married to [xxx]*ė*, only to [xxx]-*ienė* [e4]

> "I knew very well why I was choosing the shortened option. It was a second marriage for my husband, and I did not want to be the second -ienė with the same surname"[217]

Embedded in the framework of the good wife discourse (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 116), these accounts demonstrate that the embodied named identity (Pilcher 2017) of traditionally surnamed woman functions as a site of struggle and tension for contemporary Lithuanian women. The affective dimension of the discursive constructions regarding the aesthetic and life-style characteristics of the carriers of the traditional surname is strengthened by the bodily presence of *real* traditionally named bodies of other equally named female subjects affiliated to one concrete male surname. In most narratives - these other embodiments are represented by the figure of one's mother-in-law. The postfeminist discursive regime - as one of the dominant gendered knowledge/practice regimes (Gill 2017) - is, thus, employed

[216] Emphasis in original;
[217] Ruškutė, Eglė. "Vardas ir pavardė - būdas išsiskirti." *Vakarų ekspresas,* 8 Sept. 2012, p. 4.

in regaining the broken foundations of intelligibility and, thus, re-establishing positive moral selves (Lazar in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 73). The fact that a postfeminist or, more precisely, an individualizing discourse of gendered neoliberalism in women's narratives of non-traditional self-naming is used as a depoliticizing (Litosseliti et al. 2019) discursive strategy in performing ideal femininity (Cancian in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 93) is supported by the fact that, while widely present in private semi-structured interviews of women who had been promised total confidentiality, references to the unwillingness to obtain the surname due to its connection to the mother-in-law are generally absent from the media accounts.

Conclusion on aesthetics

To sum up, neoliberal paradigms of individual choice and aesthetic preference, when read in the light of postfeminist scholarship, demonstrate how contemporary Lithuanian women use depoliticizing discourses of postfeminism as culturally acceptable resources in performing their non-traditional marital femininities. They construct the process of self-naming as practices of beautification or symbolic entrepreneurship (Lazar 2017) that are seen as adding cultural value through symbolic constructions of individualized youthful marital sexuality that form semantic affinities with global cultural manifestations of postfeminist femininity. While, to many of the respondents of my study, traditionally suffixed marital names bring out associations with dull, domesticated and unappealing femininities, the presence of women who have obtained the new surname as an alternative way to identify as a married woman suggests that the new surname is perceived as a tool in constructing individualized marital femininities that fail to disturb the foundations of patrilineal marital tradition. As some of the respondents have noted, they did not have an intention to hide their marital status. In fact, the new surname is seen as inevitably associated with a new way to *do* marital femininities.

Returning to the rhetorical question posed by Thwaites (2017b), I would argue that by making their choice to not obtain the traditional suffix *-ienė*, Lithuanian women are taking a stand against a culturally overburdened (Gill 2007) signifier loaded with ethno-linguistic sentiments of national pride, but closely intertwined with heteronormative definitions of appropriate femininity (Cancian in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 93). However, the reflexive

process at the micro level of these narratives also reveals that traditionally named femininites are perceived as representing old, domestic, dull and, thus, abject femininities, embodied by ageing women, often associated with the figure of the mother-in-law, which activates animosity and hostility for it is seen as hijacking the possibility of performing individualized, empowered and youthful marital feminitites. Consequently, while Clarke et al. argue that references to the aesthetic qualities of the marital surname "divest them of any political or ideological significance" (2008: 435), I contend that postfeminist scholarship on the politics of aesthetic labour in contemporary gender regimes enables us to investigate the political content of women's choices and, as I argue in later chapters, serves as an exegetical paradigm in positioning their naming practices within a macro level discussion in relation to the new femininities in a postsocialist context.

The paradigm of heterosexual imaginary

The taken-for-grantedness (Carter 2019) or, as Pilcher has described it, the functional fixedness (2017) of the heteronormative traditionalism of these non-traditional naming practices could be understood as women's way to calibrate (Cairns and Johnston 2015) between symbolic embodiments of femininities, rejected within situated gender regimes. While, as it has been discussed, refusing traditional suffixes of married women works as a performative speech act (Austin 1962) that rejects symbolic associations with historically situated domesticated and ageing femininities, keeping (or choosing the short version of one's) maiden surname after marriage might be seen as embodying a single woman or a spinster, thus loosing all the cultural credentials that are provided to matrimonial femininities by the "heteronormative regulations which priviledge couple relationships" (Budgeon 2008: 301). As a matter of fact, an absence of cases within my data of women who have decided to *shorten*[218] their own birth surname instead of taking the non-suffixed surname of their husband demonstrates that the introduction of non-suffixed female surnames in contemporary Lithuania has in a way failed to extend a list of what Jessica Ringrose and Valerie Walkerdine have called "inhabitable female [marital] subjectivities" (2008). And while, as it will be discussed later, narratives of divorced women demonstrate

[218] Get rid of the traditional suffix *-aitė, -ytė, -utė* from their birth surname and leave only an ending *-ė*;

more variable use of this linguistic reform, stories of marital self-naming are inevitably determined by "[t]he ideological force of couple culture" (Budgeon 2008: 302).

According to Shelley Budgeon, couple relationships are essential to the normative social organization of sexuality (2008: 302) and scholars of female naming practices have argued that names serve as important technologies of the self in maintaining this gendered social organisation (Thwaites 2017). Moreover, some have put forward the idea that it is precisely because of its connotations with romance and love that the patrilineal naming practices have escaped women's ability to scrutinize the asymmetrical nature of these practices (Hoffnung 2006; Robnett and Leaper 2013). In fact, it is around the privileged idea of the couple culture - or what Adrienne Rich (1980) has called the heterosexual imaginary (in Wilkinson 2012: 130) - that respondents of this study construct the notion that obtaining the husband's surname upon marriage serves as a symbolic gesture in creating a family.

For many participants of the study, an idea of a heteronormative family as, first and foremost, built on individualized romantic coupledom emerges from the way respondents construct both spaciotemporal and symbolic disengagements from other units of their extended family - mostly those of the in-laws, as it is with the families of the in-laws (as well as with the families of male siblings of the husband) that the *new* family of participants is linguistically connected.

First of all, many of the interviewed women perceive marriage as a symbolic rite of passage where the change of women's family name encapsulates their transition from one spatiotemporal dimension to another:

> I work as a journalist [...] So it was important for me to keep [my maiden surname] because my surname is my business card [...] The non-suffixed surname [of my husband] is also very important to me because it is a new period of my life. [d3]

> [Non-suffixed] surname of my husband after hyphen shows that two independent people, two families that have united [d2]

> I did not consider the option of not changing my surname. To me, this is a strong symbol that marks something new, the beginning of my own family. This was a psychological transition from the home of my parents to my own home where I will be a mother now [e17]

Feminist scholars invested into explorations of the role of affect in power and technologies of subject formation (Elias et al. 2017: 17) have argued that contemporary knowledge/practice regimes construct the notion of happiness as dependant on romantic partnership and particularly marriage: the ordering logic of happiness, according to Sarah Ahmed (2007), "is evident around the idealisation of marriage" (in Taylor 2012: 25). Looking back at the accounts, one could argue that marital surnames of women are perceived as symbolic tools that separate different temporalities of before and after, where the new temporality is also perceived as holding access to a happy future.

One could argue that the whole set of earlier discussed discursive repertoires that I see as belonging to the paradigm of aesthetic preference also belong to the symbolic construction of individualized family units that participants performatively construct within their narratives of self-naming. Especially because discursive repudiations of marital female subjectivities associated with dull and ageing married women are frequently followed by the discourse that non-suffixed female surnames serve as symbolic representatives of distinct family units. To paraphrase one of the respondents, differently from traditionally suffixed surnames that indicate an appearance of yet another woman married to, say, Kazlauskas[219], participants see their non-suffixed family names as a performative act of establishing a separate family (of two) constructed around the notion of romantic coupledom detached from larger networks of kin families.

> I wanted a surname of my husband, but I really do not like my mother-in-law. I thought I do not want to be like her, I do not want a surname like hers. Both the parents and grandparents of my husband come from the village, they worked such hard physical jobs and I thought this [new surname] creates a possibility to start a new line, new karma. This my belief helped to decide on choosing -ė [e16]

[219] I have used one of the most Lithuanian surnames here with no particular reference;

> I really did not want to be [xxx]-*ienė*. To tell you the truth, partly because I did not want to identify so much with the mother of my husband. Somehow I did not want to be yet another woman who is married to [husband's surname] [e9]

> I wanted for the family to share the same surname. And - most importantly - to have the surname of my husband, but with an ending that shows female grammatical gender. One more thing - I did not want to [be -*ienė* and] share my surname with the wife of my brother-in-law [...] whom I did not like [e18]

The notion that the non-suffixed female family name is often perceived by others as an act of distancing oneself from wider family networks are also mentioned within self-naming accounts:

> A mother of my friend always emphasizes [the non-suffixed] surname of her daughter-in-law and says it means she did not want to be part of their family [e15]

> I think my in-laws have still not come to terms with my surname and my mother-in-law repeatedly called me [xxx]-*ienė*. [...] During family gatherings she says - "look, we have three [xxx]-*ienė* sitting together" [e7]

As these excerpts demonstrate, the choice of a non-suffixed form of a marital surname is perceived as a way to construct individualized family units, defined by romanticized heteronormative coupledom and detached from extended familial relations. On the one hand, this ambivalent treatment of patrilocal expectations by symbolically detaching oneself from kinship groups and communities and establishing a family of two could be seen as one way of performing what Giddens has called a detraditionalization of social systems inevitably influenced by processes of globalization (Giddens 1990). However, while destabilization of tradition creates possibilities of living one's life more autonomously, according to Giddens, it challenges our basic psychological need of ontological security (Giddens 1991). Rom and Benjamin have elaborated on the Giddean notion of romantic love as a future oriented phenomenon "connected to a sense of stability of the relationship because it provides the psychological security perceived as necessary for rearing children" (2011: 156). Consequently, one could argue that the notion of romantic love - or romantic coupledom -

plays a crucial role in narratives of non-traditional self-naming as an imaginary space of heteronormative stability and wholeness.

On the other hand, the use of the hegemonic discourse embedded within the heterosexual imaginary (in Wilkinson 2012: 130) of couple culture (Budgeon 2008: 302) could be read as a performative strategy in reclaiming the normativity of a highly contested non-traditional naming practice. When discussing the domestication of postfeminism in postsocialist Russian psy-literature, Salenniemi and Adamson have argued that "heterosexual relationships and romantic love take precedence over everything else; they form the grid of intelligibility for femininity" (2014: 95). I would argue that by positioning their rationale *back* to the domain of normative female subjectivities where changing one's name is perceived as a symbolic construction of the family, Lithuanian women with non-suffixed family names reclaim intelligibility of their marital identities. Contrary to the dominant attitudes within society[220], the choice of a non-suffixed family name after the marriage is presented as an act of dedication to the newly formed heteronormative union rather than a way to "hide" one's marital status:

> "I chose this surname because I had the right to choose. Plus, Viržintė suited better with my first name than Viržintienė. I did not distance myself from my husband Tomas by doing this - I did give up my maiden surname", - says the woman. Not only she has the surname of her husband - she always wears her wedding ring which shows that she is married[221]

However, it is important to underline that regardless of the fact that women repeatedly argue that their non-traditional naming practices were founded on their desire to embody individualized and unique marital identities that symbolize a creation of distinguished and unique units of heteronormative unions, their contemplations about potential or actual choices of the family names of their daughters supports the fact that the non-suffixed surname in contemporary Lithuania is first and foremost perceived as a linguistic tool in constructing and negotiating marital female identities[222]. According to the existing

[220] Discussed in Part II and well described by Miliūnaitė 2013;
[221] Indrė Viržintė. Dovidavičienė, Snieguolė. "*Nenorėjau būti '-ienė'.*" Lietuvos Rytas, 12 May 2009, www.gyvbudas.lrytas.lt/seima/2009/05/12/news/nenorejau-buti--iene--5805417/ [accessed 1 Nov. 2013]
[222]However, more critical positions in relation to this topic have been expressed by respondents from the "'Feminist sample" and will be discussed later in this chapter.

Lithuanian naming laws, male and female children receive different surnames. Besides having differently ending patronymic family names showing the grammatical gender of the surname (usually *-us*, *-as,* -is for boys and *-ė* for girls), female children also get a suffix *-aitė-*, *-ytė-*, *-utė-, -iūtė-* to demonstrate their status of an unmarried woman. However, since 2003, it is also legally possible to omit the traditional suffix leaving only an ending *-ė* that indicates the grammatical gender of the personal name[223]. Nonetheless, as available data from 2011 - as well my own sample - demonstrates[224], this practice is largely unpopular among Lithuanian families. Women who have opted for a non-suffixed marital name also rarely report haven skipped the traditional suffix when naming their daughters[225]. Therefore, I would like to further look into the question of how participant's of my study make sense of the use (of lack thereof) of the non-suffixed surname when naming their newborn daughters.

Naming their daughters

Many Lithuanian people I have talked to during the years of my research perceive the new shorter version of a woman's surname as strongly associated with *doing* marital identities:

> What surnames have the daughters of those who chose the *neutral -ė* ending? -Aitės and -ytės once again! I do not know of any parents who would have given the same neutral surname to their daughters. Do you? So the *-ė* ending does SHOW the marital status[226]

In fact, a few of the respondents[227] who have given non-suffixed family names to their daughters describe various incidents that reveal that the new surname is perceived as only belonging to the marital domain of adult women:

> My mother-in-law who was very supportive of my short surname before my marriage [...] was very displeased to find out that our daughter had been called by the same [short] family name. [She said] that [this surname] definitely does not fit to name the child. [A doctor once] commented on the

[223] In the case of my personal surname, omitting suffix *-ait-* from my 'maiden' surname would mean I would receive surname *Bisigirskė* instead of *Bisigirskaitė*;
[224] "Neutralios moterų pavardės plačiai nepaplito." *15min.lt,* 9 Apr. 2011, https://www.15min.lt/naujiena/laisvalaikis/ivairenybes/neutralios-moteru-pavardes-placiai-nepaplito-61-1453899
[225] With an exception of participants from the 'feminist' sample.
[226] Donata. Comment on "Vyriška pavardė būsimai žmonai." Uzdarbis.lt, 23 Sept. 2019, www.uzdarbis.lt/t411926/vyriska-pavarde-busimai-zmonai/ [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]
[227] Nearly all from the "Feminist Sample".

> surname of my daughter - "yikes, what an ugly surname. We must be proud of our Lithuanian roots" [f19]
>
> [People in my circles believe that] [xxx]-*aitė* is such a beautiful surname, why would one call a little girl [xxx]-*ė*. Then everyone will think she is married. The child will feel weird being different among her peers [f10]
>
> My daughter has a surname with an ending -ė. From what I gathered while registering [her surname] - this is an absolute exception[228]

Consequently, it is probably not surprising that women who have chosen the short version of the surname at marriage for themselves are hesitant about the possibility of giving the new form of the family name to their daughters, and the exceptionality and uniqueness of the new surname that is celebrated within women's narratives of marital self naming is perceived as a potential impediment when contemplating the possibility of imposing this surname on their daughters. As Rom and Benjamin have also observed, "[c]hildren draw the boundary between the traditional and the innovative naming practices, and many women do not dare or are unable to cross it" (2011: 75). Contrary to the earlier presented neoliberal constructions of their surname choice as unaffected by the opinions of others, while talking about their actual choices of naming of their children or contemplating the possibility of giving the new surnames to their daughters in the future, many respondents consistently opt for traditionally suffixed surnames of unmarried women:

> I gave surnames with suffix -*iūtė* to both of my daughters. For only one reason - children are cruel and I did not want for them to face questions about their surname. I will not be with them at school, life is already hard enough, I do not see why make it more difficult [f1]
>
> I don't know. Maybe [xxx]-*aitė*. Ten years ago when I was pregnant I thought I would call her [xxx]-*aitė*. Because it was unusual and I did not want her to be bullied for this. Honestly - I do not know. [e7][229]

[228] Vita. Comment on "Vyriška pavardė būsimai žmonai." Uzdarbis.lt, 23 Sept. 2019, www.uzdarbis.lt/t411926/vyriska-pavarde-busimai-zmonai/ [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]
[229] Respondent has two sons;

> This [surname] would give the child some sort of exceptionality and so as long as the child is a baby, I really do not know what kind of person she will be when she grows up, when she goes to school. Would she like being different and she would not mind potential comments. Or maybe she will have a different character and this would bring unpleasant feelings to her. I guess I would call her [xxx]-*ytė* [e3]

One of the participants actually admitted that she regrets not haven given the *short* version of the family name to her daughters out of fear that their unusual surnames would cause misunderstandings at school:

> We gave traditional surnames [xxx]-*aitė* to two of our daughters. Longer surnames sounded better next to their first names and we did not want questions and misunderstanding to appear due to their surnames. It seemed that it is still uncommon for a girl to have the non-suffixed surname. But now I regret [this decision] and if I could change back time I would give both of my daughters surnames with no suffixes. This way all the females of the family would share one form of the surname, and all the males - the same. By the way, my own mother was very surprised to hear I gave traditionally suffixed surnames to my daughters. She said - you took the *modern* one for yourself, but you left your daughters with an old one. So what was your purpose? [e18]

Thus, using potential peer pressure as one of the reasons to follow traditional naming practices of children and arguing for the aesthetic appeal of the traditional "maiden" surname, participants from the my sample repeatedly claim that they like the sound of traditionally suffixed surnames when it comes to little girls, and that the non-suffixed surname belongs to the realm of adult women:

> Most probably we would give the surname of my husband with the traditional suffix -*aitė*. Once again, because it sounds nicer [e6]

> I like when little girls have the surname -*ytė* [e17]

> I would choose traditional [suffixes]. I like this tradition of maiden surname [e16]

> I would call my daughter -*aitė*. I do not know why, just feel this way [e10]

> I did not because there is no surname more beautiful than [xxx]-*aitė* [d1]

> My 2.5 year old daughter has a traditionally suffixed surname. Me and my husband have decided that - to a little girl - this version of the surname suits next to her first name and simply sounds nice. If she so wishes, she can change her surname in the future [d3]

> I understand the surname with an ending *-ė* to be a surname of a married woman. One only decides on the ending depending on the aesthetics of the surname. I do not see it as a surname that does not show one's marital surname, as something neutral [e4]

> In my opinion, giving the [non-suffixed] surname to the daughter and choosing surname on marriage are not identical situations. Differently from the first, in the second case, this decision is made by an adult and self-responsible individual [e14]

> First of all, if the surname ends with *-ė,* it means that the woman is not anymore *-ytė, -aitė, or -utė.* It means she has either married (and so it shows her marital status) or she did not like her maiden surname (which happens rarely)[230]. So I do not agree that this type of surname does not show your marital status [e3]

As it has been discussed, while participants talk about *their own* non-traditional marital naming choices as an exclusively individualistic and independent choice and reject any influence of their husbands, the role of their spouses in naming their children is often presented as an important factor.

> The choice of the surname [of our daughter] will depend on the position of my husband. I do not have a strong opinion on this question [e17]

> We have already named our daughter - she got the maiden form of my husband's family name. Why? Because my husband is very strongly against the neutral version. To him, it is a mutilation of the language. [c5]

Interestingly, especially when it comes to referring to already named rather than hypothetical children, participants often change their rhetorics into rather short and plain answers that, I would argue, point to the fact that patronymic naming practices of children function as sites of traditionalism - a domain that "presents a powerful convergence of discursive and marital

[230]There is a practice to take the *-ė* surname after divorce, which this respondent does not consider; The possibility of getting this type of surname upon birth is also not considered by this participants;

silence" (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 184). For example, when asked whether she would consider giving a non-suffixed surname to her (then, potential) daughter, one of the participants enthusiastically replied:

> Of course I would! The surname would be shorter and more fun. On the other hand, there would be less misunderstandings if she was to live abroad [e15]

Knowing that this participant had recently had a daughter, I asked whether she did give a non-suffixed surname to her child. She replied neither she nor her husband knew this was at all possible and registered their daughter with the traditionally suffixed surname. She said her husband was the one in charge of sorting the bureaucratic procedures and he was not informed about the possibility of giving a non-suffixed surname to babies. She also added that now that she is aware of this possibility she would seriously consider changing her daughter's surname at a later stage. A few years later I inquired whether her daughter had remained with the initial birth surname. With no further explanation, she replied: "Yes, she remained *-ytė*". Along the same lines another participant who presented a rather extensive account on her marital self-naming, replies: "We gave both of our daughters surnames with traditional suffixes." [e13]

A telling example of the role men play in deciding against non-traditional naming of daughters is described by one of the public figures in Lithuanian media, Daiva Tamošiūnaitė-Budrė:

> "My daughter Adelė is fascinated by this surname. While her birth certificate says her surname is *Budrytė,* she presents herself as Adelė Budrė to new acquaintances. We have discussed the possibility of her [also] changing her surname [to the non-suffixes one], but her father strongly disagrees with that. As soon as we succeed in convincing him, we will both be going to fix the documents"[231]

Therefore, despite the fact that some men seem to support or, as in a case below, tolerate women's choice of non-suffixed marital surname, they are less likely to give up their

[231] Daiva Tamošiūnaitė-Budrė in Jutkonė, Vaida. "Pavardė - iššūkis netolerantiškai visuomenei" *Vakarų ekspresas,* 21 July, 2007, www.ve.lt/naujienos/lietuva/lietuvos-naujienos/pavarde---issukis-netolerantiskai-visuomenei-/ [accessed 8 June 2015]

patronymic privilege when naming their daughters. In fact, even when some women report having chosen a non-suffixed surname for their daughter with the support of their husband[232], none of them have questioned the patronymic tradition of naming the children after the father:

> My husband was, first, in favour of me taking his surname, but then he changed his mind and told me that he expects of our children to be named after him[233]

Consequently, the above mentioned example of an enthusiastic reaction to the possibility of sharing the non-suffixed surname with her daughter and a contradictory result when actually making that choice sheds a light of suspicion on all the other positive responses in relation to the possibility of applying this non-traditional naming practice when naming the children. Supporting the research that an arrival of a child into one's family usually manifests a shift toward traditionalism (Liss and Erchull 2012; see also Coltrane 2000), while some respondents from the "General Sample" say they would potentially consider the possibility of giving their daughters the short version of their family name [e2] [e1] [c2] [c3] [e8] [e15], only two participants from this group report actually haven given the non-suffixed surname to their daughters[234]. Interestingly, in one instance, due to the fact that the surname of her husband contains a diminutive suffix *-ut-,* both the neutral surname of the participant herself *and* the non-suffixed surname of her daughter have a linguistic quality of sounding like yet another "maiden" surname[235]. This feature served as an important factor when deciding on the surname of the child as this version would not stand out within her cohort:

> We named our daughter [xxx-ut]-*ė*. It was a natural choice and I and my husband decided without any big discussions. It sounds nice, will be convenient while living abroad and it does not sound too provocative while living in Lithuania. Also, it is easier to give your child a surname [identical] to that of one of the parents while living abroad. And now try to guess if she is married or not! [e9]

---

[232] An obsolute majority of them - from the "Feminist Sample".
[233] Eglė. "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]
[234] A study performed by Liss and Erchull (2012) sheds lights on these kind of disparities when comparing practices of self-labeled feminist non-mothers and feminist mothers, concluding that liberal feminist believes that dominate accounts of anticipated mothers are overshadowed by cultural feminist discourse in accounts of feminist actual mothers.
[235] An equivalent example would be: Pumputis (husband) - Pumputė (wife and daughter)

Interestingly, the second participant who reports sharing her non-suffixed surname with her two daughters also currently resides outside Lithuania. Referring to the patronymic traditions of the UK (where her family currently lives), she underlines her transcultural position as a decisive factor in deciding on the family names of the female members of her family:

> First of all, I chose the surname [xxx]*ė* because [xxx]*ienė* is very long. We live in the UK and [the long surname] would be really hard to spell. And generally [xxx]*ė* feels closer to my heart. We got used to it and all is good. My two daughters are also called [xxx]*ė* [e11]

A few other participants have also suggested they would consider non-suffixed surnames for their daughters as a more convenient option to live and travel outside Lithuania:

> I have to admit I have never thought about that, but I guess I would choose that which is easier and more convenient to live with abroad [e5]

Of course I would! The surname would be shorter and more fun. On the other hand, there would be less misunderstandings if she was to live abroad [e15]

> Of course. Because I think this is more comfortable. We travel a lot and I believe my daughter would travel too. Lithuanian surnames are really long and hard to pronounce [e2]

Interestingly, while respondents with *short* surnames who reside in Lithuania refrain from giving their daughters non-suffixed surnames in fear of potential peer pressure and bullying due to their unusual surname, Lithuanian families who are currently living abroad see traditionally suffixed female surnames as an impediment and search for linguistic strategies in creating transcultural identities. According to the available statistics, since 1990, the number of residents living in Lithuania has dropped by 700 000 due to migration[236] and scholars of naming practices have argued that personal names often serve as tools of acculturation for migrant communities trying to assimilate within "host" cultures (Gerhards and Hans 2009). A telling example of how traditional naming practices can turn into a

[236] "How much has Lithuania's population decreased?" *Europos migracijos tinklas,* 2018, 123.emn.lt/en/#chart-14-desc [accessed 11 Dec. 2019]

burden when living abroad is delivered by a woman who is currently living in Ireland and is married to a Lithuanian man:

> "Used to the fact that husband and wife have the same surname, employees in Irish social and migration officers did not want to believe that a husband and wife would have different surnames - Mr. Kavaliauskas and Mrs. Kavaliauskienė. [...] Even more complications occurred when their daughter was born and she had to go to kindergarten and - later - to school. Irish clerks found it strange that a husband and a wife with different surnames brought a girl who has yet another version of a family name ending with *-aitė*"[237]

Consequently, while my data only hints to this tendency of acculturation, given the high number of Lithuanians currently living abroad a further study into the role of non-suffixed female surnames as a form of cultural assimilation would be welcome. This is particularly relevant in relation to the fact that, as I argue in the subsequent part of this chapter, Western patronymic practices in which all the family members share identical family names are often perceived as a highly desirable way of *doing family* or, to be more precise, *doing* female marital identities. Scholars of Slovak naming practices have argued that the growing rejection of the feminising suffixes *-ov-* within these language communities is related to "the intensified globalization, international mobility and intermarriage that Slovakia has started to experience" (Molnar Satinska and Valentova in Sloboda et al. 2018: 273). Similarly, discursive orientation towards embodiments of certain transnational female marital subjectivities, as will be discussed, plays an important part within narratives of self-naming by contemporary Lithuanian women.

Transcultural factor

According to Nira Yuval-Davis, women's memberships in national collectivities tend to be regulated discriminately in relation to those of men as "there are always rules, regulations and policies which are specific to them" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 24). Patronymic naming practices - and especially traditional Lithuanian naming practices that categorize women according to their marital status - could be seen as a perfect example of how patriarchal,

[237] Mikelionis, Dalius. "Biržietės pavardžių trumpinti neskuba." *Biržiečių žodis,* 23 June 2009, p. 11.

nationalistic and cultural ideologies intersect and inform institutionalized notions of state-citizenship that apply to only one group of members of a particular collectivity. Scott et al. have argued that patronymic naming systems developed together with other legal practices[238] during the process of modern state-making as an important tool in producing subjects that are legible to the state (2002: 15). Yuval-Davis uses T.H. Marshall's definition of citizenship as full membership in the community and, thus, expands an understanding of state-citizenship as multi-layered and diverse, "relating to local, ethnic, state and often trans-state communities" (Yuval-Davis 1997: 24). As certain accounts by Lithuanian women demonstrate, their family names pose a threat to their ability to function as legible subjects due to their transnational positioning. Living between two (or more) collectivities that prescribe different (patrilineal) rules and regulations of women's naming forces them to navigate between naming practices and policies ascribed to them by their state-citizenship *and* communities of practice of the country they reside in. So much so that the tensions between the rigidness of the Lithuanian ethno linguistic ideology that determines the illegibility of certain groups of Lithuanian citizens[239] and women's aspirations to achieve full membership in the community of residence only seem to be solvable by giving up the Lithuanian citizenship altogether:

> "[...] Odeta Janavičiūtė [got married in Sweden] and, as it is common in Sweden, the woman got the surname of her husband - Ščiupokas. It is easier to deal with bureaucracy if one has the same surname as the husband because one does not need to explain why they have different surnames. Not long ago, her [Lithuanian] passport expired. She has contacted The Embassy of Lithuanian in Sweden asking for a passport with her new surname Ščiupokas. She was told: '[...] Lithuanian law does not allow women to have male surnames'. [Consequently] she chose to keep her maiden surname in her new passport. She currently has two documents. On the Swedish identification card she is called Ščiupokas, on her Lithuanian passport - Janavičiūtė. 'Why some married women in Lithuania are allowed to have male surnames[240] and others are not?' - she asks and admits she has considered to become a Swedish citizen so she could have the surname that is easier to live with in Sweden"[241]

[238] Together with deeds, wills and testaments and property exchange (Scott et al. 2002: 15);
[239] Such as Lithuanian citizens of Polish ethnic;
[240] Here she refers to the earlier discussed Lithuanian women married to non-Lithuanian citizens as well as to non-Lithuanian citizens of Lithuanian ethnicity;
[241] Laurutytė, Oksana. "Problemos dėl vyriškos pavardės atveria vartus daugvyrystei?" Alfa.lt, 25 Sept. 2015, www.alfa.lt/straipsnis/49914252/problemos-del-vyriskos-pavardes-atveria-vartus-daugvyrystei www.alfa.lt [accessed 12 11 2018]

> "The deputy at the Civil Registration office had only one suggestion - give up Lithuanian citizenship if you want to get a *male* surname"[242]

Non-suffixed family names, thus, often serve as a compromise. Similarly to the discussions concerning the naming of daughters, the repertoire of pragmatism that defines non-suffixed surnames as shorter and easier to pronounce for non-Lithuanian speakers plays a crucial role in narratives of women who deal with linguistic dilemmas due to their transcultural positioning. It is due to its capacity to shorten otherwise long and complicated traditionally suffixed female surnames *and* to construct family names that look and sound more alike and, thus, resemble common Western patrilineal naming practices that the new surname is often chosen as a second best option in constructing global or modern femininities:

> "[Neutral surnames] are more often requested by women aged 30-45 and especially those who travel a lot or have other connections to foreign countries"[243]

> Third, I live in London, I work as a teacher and children would have problems pronouncing my long complicated surname [f11]

> I chose without much hesitation purely out of pragmatic reasons - we lived, studied and worked abroad and I often faced inconvenience due to my [maiden] surname [f19]

> I chose because of one simple reason - I wanted a shorter surname that would be easier to write and to pronounce especially while living abroad. However, even now I often have to explain why my surname differs from my husband's. [e5]

> "Even though surname Bačėnaitė is the most beautiful to me, out of respect to my husband and due to the fact that we live abroad I chose this version"[244]

---

[242] Černiauskas, Šarūnas. "Pavardės su vyriška galūne panorusi moteris sulaukė pasiūlymo atsisakyti Lietuvos pilietybės." Delfi.lt, 27 July 2012, https://www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/pavardes-su-vyriska-galune-panorusi-moteris-sulauke-pasiulymo-atsisakyti-lietuvos-pilietybes.d?id=59198463 [accessed 12 11 2018]

[243] Digrytė, Eglė. "Lietuvos moterys neutralias pavardes renkasi retai, bet dažniausiai - visam laikui." *Delfi.lt,* 4 Nov. 2006, www.delfi.lt/gyvenimas/istorijos/lietuvos-moterys-neutralias-pavardes-renkasi-retai-bet-dazniausiai-visam-laikui.d?id=8940936 [accessed 18.11.13]

[244]Milda Bačėnaitė-Rastenė in Taškūnaitė, Julija. "Neutralios moterų pavardės - atsiskyrimas nuo santuokos?" *Lietuvos žinios,* 21 Oct 2013, www.lzinios.lt/lzinios/print.php?idas=165770 [accessed 1 Nov. 2013]

To sum up, non-suffixed family names often serve as pragmatic choices for women who performatively calibrate between patrilocal naming practices prescribed to them by their state-citizenship *and* local rules and practices of patrilineal naming of their country of residence which often expect that both spouses - as well as their children - share a morphologically identical family name. The new surname, thus, serves as the most pragmatic linguistic alternative to reportedly long and culturally burdened traditionally suffixed Lithuanian surnames. Importantly, the "Western" surname that is identical to that of their husband (even in the case of Lithuanian surnames that indicate male grammatical gender) is perceived by a growing number of contemporary Lithuanian women as a prefered option of marital self-naming. Consequently, in the subsequent part of this chapter I argue that discursive constructions of the family as an isolated territory founded on the sentiment of romantic coupledom reflect a post-colonial desire to construct modern or global marital femininities as modelled by Anglo-Saxon patrilineal marital naming practices.

The paradigm of global dispositions

Important information about the fact that many Lithuanian women who opted for non-suffixed family names after marriage would have preferred to obtain a surname identical to that of their husbands' can be found within the Lithuanian media. According to the testimonies of various officers from different Civil Registry Divisions, Lithuanian women often come to the Civil Registry with the hope that they could really share the same surname with their husband after marriage, which means they are willing to obtain the form of the surname that indicates grammatical male gender.

> "When filling an application [for marriage] quite a few women indicate that they want a surname equal to that of their husband. But we cannot grant women a male surname. Then some of them decide to become *-ienė*, others choose a neutral surname"[245]

> "Civil Registry Division [in Kaunas] often receives requests from women to obtain a surname equal to that of their husband"[246]

[245] Valevičienė, Daiva. "Ponia pageidauja pono pavardės." *Kauno diena,* 9 Aug. 2005, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/ponia-pageidauja-pono-pavardes.d?id=7252585 [accessed 13 Aug, 2019]
[246] Kulinskaitė, Jorūnė. "Jaunamarčių rebusas-pavardė." *Kauno diena,* 23 Aug. 2009, p. 9.

Preferences towards Western patronymic tradition are also expressed by Lithuanian women both within the media accounts and in my semi-structured questionnaires where a non-suffixed family name is often perceived as a second best option in obtaining a surname closer to that of the husband rather than that of one's mother-in-law:

> "I wanted to have the surname of my husband, not of my mother-in-law. As this is not possible in Lithuania, I chose the short version of [his] surname"[247]

> "A young woman decided to take advantage of the new opportunity and chose the surname Trumpė (her husband's surname is Trumpa). According to Ingrida, her choice was spontaneous [...] and her husband accepted it unconditionally due to its beautiful sounding. I. Trumpė admitted that she would have preferred for her surname to be Trumpa, but granting women with surnames that indicate grammatical male gender is against the rules of the Lithuanian language"[248]

> I wanted a surname identical to that of my husband - [xxx]*us* and [xxx]*us* - but as the Lithuanian law to this day does not allow this option, I had to take the short version. To me, [xxx]*ė* sounds short and clear, plus this is much more modern than *-ienė*. Young women today often choose this option [ending *-ė*] because it is closer to modernity and we hope that one day it will be possible to also take the 'male' version of the surname [e8]

> I will not change my [maiden] surname into his until I am allowed to take a surname identical to that of my husband [a8]

However, it must be noted that male surnames are only unavailable to women who marry Lithuanian citizens. Women who have *foreign* spouses or men of Lithuanian ethnicity but of foreign nationality are entitled to follow naming traditions typical to their country of origin. Consequently, besides the growing number of women who form marriages with foreign citizens, there are a few public figures in Lithuania who embody this surging postcolonial desire to construct transcultural marital femininities following Western practices of marital self-naming. Women like Lidija Rasutis, Izolda Gudelis, Aurelija Simutis, Daina Bosas

[247] Jurevičiūtė, Lina. "Nuotakos renkasi skambias pavardes." *Šiaulių naujienos*, 28 Aug. 2010, www.tv3.lt/naujiena/lietuva/499613/nuotakos-renkasi-skambias-pavardes[accessed 19.11.13]
[248] Spundzevičienė, Giedrė. "Naujos moterų pavardės maskuoja šeiminę padėtį." *Gimtasis Rokiškis,* 8 March 2008, p.5.

embody those modern or global visibilities that a growing amount of contemporary Lithuanian women would choose to embrace when given a possibility:

> "According to her, Lithuanian language must definitely be protected - from barbarisms, from street slang, but not from the diversity of surnames. I. Viržintė admires famous women who [...] even have male surnames. 'Lidija Rasutis, Izolda Gudelis… Who would tell that they are not married, not serious or not Lithuanian?'- asks the woman"[249]

> I personally really like the foreign practice when all the family members, independently from their gender, have the same surname with the same ending [e14]

Satisfaction with not having to deal with the burden of the suffix is expressed by one of the above mentioned women - Daina Bosas - who has been interviewed more than once about her unusual surname choice:

> "When getting married, a woman chooses the surname of her husband out of respect and love for him. This is an important motive. Plus, this is a common practice. But I do not understand those who say that surnames with the suffix demonstrate woman's belonging to the family [...] I was lucky - I had the right to choose. I have Danish citizenship and Danish law does not have limitations in this respect. Before marriage, me and my husband have decided that my surname will be Bosas and this solution was pleasant for both of us"[250].

Following Daina Bosas, the possibility of choosing a marital surname identical to that of her husband is perceived as luck and a privilege of non-citizens of Lithuania who are not expected to carry this burden of representation (Yuval-Davis 1997) assigned to them both by institutionalized language ideology *and* by bureaucratic procedures that regulate women's memberships in national collectivities.

> It is not fair that those who marry 'foreign' men do not have to ponder over which suffix to choose after marriage as they get the non-suffixed surname exactly as the one of their spouses; we, instead, are the *pathetic* ones who could only find a Lithuanian husband and so we do not have that option" [a8]

---

[249] Dovidavičienė, Snieguolė. "*Nenorėjau būti '-ienė'.*" Lietuvos Rytas, 12 May 2009, www.gyvbudas.lrytas.lt/seima/2009/05/12/news/nenorejau-buti--iene--5805417/ [accessed 1 Nov. 2013]
[250] Ibid.

A growing interest of women to obtain male surnames after marriage is not only evidenced by a number of public inquiries where they reach out for support and legal consultation in their pursuit of yet another type of non-traditional marital naming[251], but also by a number of legal cases where Lithuanian female citizens are legally appealing for the possibility to 1) obtain the male version of the family name after the marriage (2013), 2) maintain equal surnames obtained through marriage abroad (case in 2006), or 3) acquire the masculine version of the surname as the family is planning to emigrate (case in 2003). Importantly, none of these cases had an outcome desired by the applicants. In comparison, there have been no cases of men who would like to obtain a surname of a woman in its feminine grammatical form[252]. However, despite the growing interest, to this day, Lithuanian women who marry citizens of Lithuania cannot obtain a surname that would be identical to that of their husband. An option that, as it is becoming increasingly clear both from private and public testimonies of Lithuanian women, would be a prefered option of marital self-naming for many Lithuanian women:

> Given the possibility, we would all choose [foreign] surnames [a8]

> When choosing the surname of my husband, I would like to take its *original* version without distorting it with all kinds of endings. Unfortunately, this is not possible[253]

The psychosocial dimension of self-naming narratives is particularly animated by those who express a strong sense of injustice and - in some cases - pure rage in relation to the fact that

[251]Frankenstein. Comment on "Vyriška pavardė būsimai žmonai." Uzdarbis.lt, 23 Sept. 2019, www.uzdarbis.lt/t411926/vyriska-pavarde-busimai-zmonai/ [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]

Ališauskaitė, Greta. "Specialistai atsakė svajojantiems apie pavardės keitimą: išsidirbinėti nepavyks." *TV3.lt,* 1 April 2017, www.tv3.lt/naujiena/lietuva/904601/specialistai-atsake-svajojantiems-apie-pavardes-keitima-issidirbineti-nepavyks [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]

"Klausk teisininko: ar po vestuvių galiu pasirinkti vyrišką pavardę?" *Delfi.lt*, 13 Jul, 2019, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/law/klausk-teisininko-ar-po-vestuviu-galiu-pasirinkti-vyriska-pavarde.d?id=81701899 [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]

Aržuolaitienė, Kristina. "Moteris nenori būti nei Aleknienė, nei Aleknė, o pavardės Alekna – neleidžia: institucijos siuntinėja viena pas kitą." *15min.lt,* 24 Feb. 2018, www.15min.lt/gyvenimas/naujiena/seima/moteris-nenori-buti-nei-alekniene-nei-alekne-o-pavardes-alekna-neleidzia-institucijos-siuntineja-viena-pas-kita-1026-930042 [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]

[252] Ibid.

[253] Henrieta. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

contemporary Lithuanian women are not allowed to choose the surname of the husband and are instead forced to settle with a surname ending *-ė* (or the Slavic ending as it has been discussed in Part II) as a second best option in their desire to construct feminine marital identities. Such identities are desired to be, on the one hand, free from unwanted associations with "dissatisfied, always complaining and lacking of affection ageing woman"[254] embodied by the figure of the mother-in-law and, on the other hand, reflect their afilliation with heteronormative marital femininities that, one could argue, belong to a new, globalized, cultural habitat:

> One year ago, I got married to my husband. He has a Ukrainian citizenship [...] My love for America, or maybe my love for my husband, or maybe my love for myself or maybe my understanding that I can be whatever I please made me decide that either I have his surname or I have none. [...] Women at the Civil Registry Office told me: "the surname of your husband is of Slavic origin, so you can be *-ienė, -ė or -a*". I really lost it there [...] Those officers reproached me commenting that us, contemporary women, have their heads full of Western nonsense. But I kept my own surname at the end. [...] With all my respect to my mother-in-law, I married her son, so I want to take his surname, not hers. [...] I will fight for my right to a male surname[255]

> I am seriously planning to sue Lithuania for the fact that I cannot choose the SURNAME OF MY HUSBAND (emphasis original) [...] I am currently planning to marry my partner and I am literally getting depressed because of the Lithuanian law, because I cannot be what I want to be, because my freedom of choice is being jeopardized. I even need psychological consultations because even the idea of *-ienė* or *-ė* brings out feelings of indescribable disgust, tremor, nervousness and helplessness (and I hate feeling helpless), anger.[256]

One could see how the inchoate tension (Johnson and Johnson 2015) between structure, culture and agency (Glasgow and Bouchard 2018) animates intensive feelings of anger and helplessness in narratives of women who categorically reject the burden of representation assigned to them by an institutionalized Lithuanian language ideology through the operation of the Lithuanian suffixes. While they often use human rights rhetorics as they refer to their lack of agency in choosing to be "who they want to be", their rage is not built on feminist

[254] Vytautė. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]
[255] Ibid.
[256] Nusivylusi Lietuva. Comment on Vytautė. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

sentiments of injustice engrained in patrilineal practices, but rather on the internalized unthinkingness of male patrilineal privilege on the one hand and their exposure to a different "cultural habitat or images that relentlessly shapes [our] tastes, desires and what [we] find beautiful" (Gill 2007: 73). I would argue that this global cultural habitat that these women see as belonging to is structured by the knowledge/practice regime of neoliberal individualism (McAvoy 2015). Their self-positioning within global rather than local community of practice through their eagerness to construct Western marital femininities could be seen as a postcolonial desire to establish global neo-traditional feminine subjectivities. Consequently, what, on the micro level, comes across as the repudiation of situated local familial femininities often embodied by the figure of the mother-in-law, on the macro level could be seen as manifestations of a postcolonial desire to establish neo-traditional femininities oriented towards the global future as opposed to the Soviet past. This is particularly relevant in relation to the fact that the heteronormativity of self-naming narratives of women who choose non-traditional family names is constructed on the notion of romantic coupledom - a symbolic site of stable futures and happiness (Ahmed 2007); embracing the Western marital naming practices is perceived as a performative transition to a new happy and stable temporality.

On the absence of feminist reasoning

According to Jean McAvoy, "the understanding of self, and the enacting and practicing of self, as a thinking, feeling, happy, sad, despairing, responsible, choosing, competent, adequate person [...] is drafted into being through available, prevailing, ideologies" (McAvoy 2015: 26). As I have discussed in this work, traditional Lithuanian women's naming practices serve as "a site of discursive struggle" (Mills 2003) where numerous ideological intersections are being actively or passively negotiated in women's self-naming accounts. The "taken-for-grantedness" (Carter 2019) of the "patriarchal imposition" (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 169) that obliges women to obtain the husband's family name on marriage. The institutionalized ethno-linguistic nationalism (Vaicekauskienė and Šepetys 2018) that expects women to perform "certain kinds of femininity" (Cameron 2003), but also structures and (in some cases) obstructs women's ability to function as legible citizens

as well as expects women to carry the "burden of representation" (Yuval-Davis 1997) by protecting traditional suffixes as an untouchable heritage of one of the most archaic Indo-European languages. Furthermore, postfeminism - "a distinctive kind of gendered neoliberalism" (Gill 2016: 611) - circulates a patterned assemblage of "ideas, images and meanings" (Banet-Weiser et al. 2019: 3) that inform - transnationally - contemporary gender regimes which prioritize confident, independent and assertive female subjects (Litosseliti et al. 2019). Finally, an affect-loaded determination to establish global marital femininities distant from certain situated patrilocal figures that inevitably represent the repudiated image of dull, domesticated and old-fashioned Soviet femininity sheds light on the postcolonial desire to establish new forms of marital femininities, located in a new, more promising spatiotemporality. It is my argument that these intersecting ideologies function as fundamental discursive resources through which "the political, the embodied, and the affective" (McAvoy 2015: 22) dimensions of female subjectivity are being constructed within women's narratives of marital self-naming. However, an outline of dominant paradigms of *choice*, *aesthetics* and *global inclinations* highlight the invisible, the *absent*; that is, the discursive hollow in relation to feminist discourse in terms of possible resources for narrating women's practices of non-traditional marital naming.

The question of women's family names has long been affiliated with the (Western) feminist movement (Thwaites 2017b: 56). Moreover, in the case of contemporary Lithuania, a refusal of traditionally suffixed surnames is understood as one of the most visible feminist campaigns in postsocialist Lithuania (Čepaitienė in Mikonytė 2011: 33). However, when it comes to the narratives of self-naming both from the "General sample" of participants *and* the Lithuanian media, one finds a disturbing absence of rationale for the discursive strategies with which the new legislation was put forward by a group of Lithuanian feminists in 2003. As discussed, a group of activists who had consistently lobbied - both through bureaucratic and media channels - for an introduction of an alternative ending of female surnames appealed to the discriminating asymmetry of the traditional naming practices, arguing that men do not have to deal with the burden of having their marital status inscribed on their personal names and all the cultural and social repercussions that come with that. As this feminist demand to adjust traditional female surnames, based on claims of discrimination and violation of gender equality, did not receive support from the members of the State

Commission of the Lithuanian language, a new appeal was issued that referred to the legal concept of indirect discrimination introduced from the European Union Equality directive. Based on the European equal rights law, it is illegal to inquire into the marital status of potential employees and traditional surnames reveal marital - that is, private - information of women, thus indirectly discriminating them against men (Miliūnaitė 2013: 82).

According to the earlier mentioned comparative study of Clarke et al., "women who do not intend to adopt their husband's last name display more feminist attitudes" (2008: 422). And, as it has been discussed, Lithuanian women who choose to keep their maiden surname upon marriage were the most critical of the traditional Lithunian naming practices compared to all the other segments of participants within the "General Sample" of data of my study. As one of the "surname keepers" concludes, why would the fact of marriage bring such asymmetrical changes on the side of a woman?

> I kept my surname after the marriage with no doubts. I had been living with it for nearly thirty years, why would my marriage bring changes for me, but for my husband - not? I have so many friends who loved their maiden surnames and became *-ienės* after marriages with frown faces[257]

Interestingly, while my study is concerned with the use of the feminist surname among contemporary Lithuanian women and their practices of sense-making in relation to their non-traditional surname choices, my data reveals little correlation between non-traditional linguistic choices and feminist sentiments[258]. Participants in my study who refused traditionally suffixed family names and rather chose a family name of their husband with an ending *-ė* have expressed no criticism towards the unfairness and inequality of traditional naming practices. While some media accounts acknowledge the fact that the new surname was an outcome of an active feminsit campaign, private interviews with the carriers of the new surname demonstrate that most of these women do not associate the non-suffixed surname with a feminist agenda. Although they often claim that they respect the wishes of other women not to show their marital status, none of them admit having chosen the new surname for that reason. Moreover, when asked what they think of the fact that the new

[257] Akvilė. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]
[258] At least until I have specifically approached members of the group *Feminism* on Facebook [1st Oct 2019];

surname has associations with feminism, many of them seemed surprised to hear that kind of connection, referring to the pop singer Natalija Zvonkė as a person more commonly associated with the new surname:

> To be honest, I have never come across this type of comments. I never thought these women are in any way connected to feminism. [...] I would really object if you called Zvonkė a feminist [c2]

> There have been some mocking reactions from my colleagues: "Oh, so you chose a surname like Zvonkė and Bunkė?" [e1]

> I do not think that type of comments are common. [...] Zvonkė is not famous for feminist attitudes, quite the contrary. She is more associated with femininity, maybe even vulgarity. [...] My choice of the surname was not motivated by feminist sentiments. Having a surname with an ending ė was not my main goal [e17]

> I have never come across that kind of comment. I think the choice of the surname is not influenced by a feminist approach, but rather by other reasons [e14]

> I do not associate *non-traditional* surnames with *hiding your marital status* and did not choose this surname because I wanted to *mask* the fact that I am married. I have never heard of any associations of this surname to feminism and never thought of it this way [e3]

Slightly more frequently, women rationalize their non-traditional marital naming as a choice that would prevent potential discrimination in the job market. Reproducing a strategic narrative of the feminist activists who argued that traditional Lithuanian surnames can cause discrimination of women in the workplace, some women suggest their choice was a pragmatic decision solely based on their wish to avoid potential obstacles in the job market:

> "I can tell from my experience that some employers make a decision whether they will take you up for a job the moment you greet them and introduce yourself as *-ienė*. Why would my ability to get a job should be influenced by my surname? I know that they instantly make their calculations - if you are married, it means you do and soon will have children, they will be getting ill, which means you will be getting sick leaves often. Some [employers] simply prefer to employ unmarried women - they will

> work overtime and you can flirt with them. So I simply told to my - I will be Urbonė [instead of Urbonienė]"[259] [260]

Margarita Jankauskaitė has argued that feminism in postsocialist Lithuania has been permeated by neoliberal market rationality (Jankauskaitė 2016: 102). So much so that questions of women's emancipation came to be seen, first and foremost, as questions related to women's participation in the workforce (Jankauskaitė 2016: 103). Consequently, "[Lithuanian] people's appreciation of women's participation in the labour market (as an economic dimension) is improving faster than acceptance of women's political involvement (a power dimension)" (Jankauskaitė 2016: 103). I have argued that neoliberal reframing of the surname problem has significantly contributed to the successful outcome of the suffix campaign and that neoliberal feminism (Rottenberg 2014) makes gendered political issues more intelligible in postsocialist Lithuania.

As a matter of fact, the tendency to see feminism as only belonging to the public domain can also be observed in the way respondents of my study have reacted to my question regarding whether they share feminist sentiments. While most women deliver short negative answers (sometimes followed by numerous exclamation marks), some claim partial support to feminist ideas; especially when it comes to the regulation of issues connected to the job market. However, they make clear distinctions between the public and private domains where, they say, they reserve their right to be treated as a woman:

> I like the feminist approach at work (regarding payrate and task distribution), but it is different at home. Me and my husband we have different spheres and I like when he takes care of me... [e12]

[259] Irina Morar-Urbonė in Jutkonė, Vaida. "Pavardė - iššūkis netolerantiškai visuomenei" *Vakarų ekspresas,* 21 July, 2007, www.ve.lt/naujienos/lietuva/lietuvos-naujienos/pavarde---issukis-netolerantiskai-visuomenei-/ [accessed 8 June 2015]

[260] What is interesting about this particular account is that while this woman emphasizes the importance of not revealing one's marital status to potential employers, her actual family name demonstrates that she has chosen an option of hyphenating her birth surname with her birth surname which, interestingly, does not have a suffixed ending due to its *Slavic* origin and, consequently, would not reveal her marital status had she chosen to not add her husband's family name. An employment of (what one would call) neoliberal feminist discourse in justifying her choice can be seen as a discursive strategy which makes highly contested actions more intelligible. However, it also reveals an intrinsic ambiguity between her embodied name-identity (Pilcher 2017) and the narrative she produces in relation to her choice and, thus, sheds light on the role of the named-body in imposing "powerful constraints or limits" (McNay 1999a: 318) to the performative nature of autobiography (Smith 1995).

> I would call myself a *moderate feminist*. I support women's equal rights, partnership in the relationship. I am more of a career woman rather than a housewife so I see myself closer to the feminists from this perspective. But I have nothing against men who open doors for me, help carry heavy bags and fix my car. In other words, I am a feminist when it suits me [e17]

Simidele Dosekun has argued that regardless of the fact that postfeminism has culturally and historically developed as a direct response to a second-wave feminism in the West, transnational manifestations of postfeminism demonstrate that it is being appropriated without its feminist history (2015: 968). Young women in the global South, for example, employ postfeminist rhetorics "without explicit consciousness of feminism" (Dosekun 2015: 968). Importantly, as they exercise the language of individual choice and empowerment, "they cannot articulate their national or local feminist histories" (Dosekun 2015: 968). Whether real of performative, the ignorance of contemporary Lithuanian women to the feminist political agenda behind the suffix reform and their extensive engagement with postfeminist rhetorics demonstrates precisely what Angela McRobbie has famously described as "double entanglement" (2009): a phenomenon of discursive "undoing" of feminist ideology, "whereby feminism is taken into account and asserted as common sense yet simultaneously feared and repudiated" (Litosseliti et al. 2019: 4). Similarly, oblivious to feminist epistemologies beyond their non-tradional surnames, participants of my study employ the new self-naming practice, but actively repudiate any affiliations with feminist political agenda.

On the other hand, a notable absence of public testimonies of women who would construct their naming narratives as political statements of criticism towards punitive categorization of women inscribed onto traditional female family names might be one of the reasons why this rationale does not enter the list of discursive repertoires most commonly used within individuals' self-naming accounts. Based on my analysis of the Lithuanian media (both press and online), besides a few critical articles mostly written by feminist activists involved with the surname reform[261], feminist discourse was fairly absent from public discussions regarding this issue. Extremely rare are public testimonies of women who claim to have

[261] Daugirdaitė, Solveiga. "Normalūs žmonės ir normalios pavardės." *Bernardinai,lt,* 3 Feb. 2010, www.bernardinai.lt/straipsnis/2010-02-03-solveiga-daugirdaite-normalus-zmones-ir-normalios-pavardes/39902 [accessed 28 Jun 2015]

chosen the new surname based on certain political motives. Moreover, none of the feminist activists who were campaigning for the suffix reform have actually changed their surname into the non-suffixed one. As one of them admitted, this campaign was more of a matter of principle[262] than her personal need for a different surname. So, while a few public figures who carry the non-suffixed surname could be associated with a feminist political agenda due to their field of interests[263], critical narratives regarding the power dimension (Jankauskaitė 2016) of traditional female surnames are generally absent from the public discourse. However, public visibilities make certain identities imaginable. This notion is confirmed by a few of the participants in my study who admitted that although new surnames initially sounded strange and served as an object of ridicule, the growing number of new surname users within the public domain made it more acceptable or, to use Ringrose and Walkerdine, extends a list of inhabitable female subjectivities (in Taylor 2012).

> When I first heard of them [...] those endings sounded funny. When this question became relevant to me personally I began thinking that some surnames with *-ė* sound quite nice [e5]

> I was a teenager at the time and I remember me and my friends would entertain ourselves making up different non-suffixed surnames and laughing at them. I really did not think at the time that I would ever choose the short version upon my own marriage. But with time more and more examples [of women with non-suffixed surnames] appeared both within the public and private circles, it became such a natural thing [e14]

Consequently, as women declare the importance of the appearance of non-traditionally suffixed gendered visibilities to have had a positive effect on their marital self-naming choices, one could speculate that the lack of feminist discourses within the public domain could have played a role in how women construct their self-naming narratives. Consequently, understanding the importance of "profoundly uneven visibilities" (Gill 2016) of non-traditionally named femininities, one of the respondents from the "Feminist Sample" declared that her decision to omit the traditional suffix from her marital surname (ending

[262] Jazukevičiūtė, Dalia. "Vilkienė nori būti Vilkė", *Veidas*, 29 May 2003.
[263] Prof. Dalia Leinartė (Historian and feminist) Virginija Cibarauskė (Literary critic, author); Lilija Henrika Vasiliauskė (The Head of the association *Vilnius Women's House*), ect.

with *-ienė*) was due to the fact that - as a public figure within women's rights field - she wanted to show an example to others [f17].

What feminists say

In 2019, after completing an in depth analysis of the "General Sample" consisting of all the collected public and private self-naming narratives of contemporary Lithuanian women, I was perplexed by an overwhelming absence of openly feminist political rhetorics in women's accounts. As discussed, ideological interventions in relation to women's family names (and, in some parts of the world, the use of feminising titles) historically have always been associated with the (Western) feminist agenda (Thwaites 2017b). The fight over the Lithuanian suffix embedded in Lithuanian women's naming practices has also been initiated by a group of feminist activists who criticised an assymetrical labelling of men and women in Lithuania's traditionally suffixed family system. However, as my analysis so far demonstrates, aware of the contested nature of their self-naming choices in relation to the national, familial, ethnic and/or gendered intersections, respondents of my study who chose the non-suffixed surname indicate the depoliticising potential of the postfeminist discourse in performatively downplaying the potentially subversive nature of their marital surnames.

Therefore, hoping to complicate the discursive homogeneity of the "General Sample", I reached out to the members of a Lithuanian speaking group *Feminizmas* on the social media platform *Facebook*. A passive member of the group myself, I have noticed many women in the group possess the new surname and was hoping their narratives would shed new light on a rather uniform use of the new surname observed so far. From over 50 members of the group who had shown their interest in completing my semi-structured questionnaire, around 30 of them returned their answers within a period of one week. As I had anticipated, members of this group have expressed much more diversity in their use of the non-suffixed surname. One must acknowledge, however, that a significant amount of time difference between the two samples (interviews with participants from the "General Sample" were largely conducted in 2015) might have played an important role in the fact that an inevitably growing number of feminine visibilities of women who posses the new surname has - during

this period of time - had an effect on women's perceptions of the new surname as an imaginable tool in re-defining their role in social relations outside of commonly used frameworks of marital femininity. Furthermore, while constructing this sample, I was particularly interested in two categories of women largely absent in the "General Sample" - those who have given the non-suffixed surname to their daughters *and* women who have chosen the *-ė* surname after divorce. So while participants of this group were invited to reply to the same questions as the one from the "General Sample", it must be acknowledged that a higher number of responses from women from the two above-mentioned categories might have been influenced by my specific interest in them. It must be underlined, however, that as a qualitative study of non-traditional self-naming of contemporary women, rather than in absolute numbers of the users of the new linguistic tool, this project is more invested in the discursive resources women employ in producing their autobiographical accounts of self-naming *and,* consequently, which bigger social phenomena can be observed through these discursive repertoires.

I also acknowledge that the labeling of the goup of participants as "Feminist Sample" can come across as imposing the idea that all of the participants of the sample share a unified understanding of feminism and, thus, belong to a homogeneous ideological group. With all the concurrently existing "set[s] of ideas, engagements and activist practices" (Gill 2016) associated with the concept, it is not the goal of this thesis to inquire how women who express interest in feminist ideas define their personal political agenda. As Geraldine Harris has observed, "[a]lthough it signifies an ideological movement and therefore a metanarrative [feminism] has always for the most part consisted of diverse individuals, addressing sexual political issues in different ways) (in Eshleman and Halley 2016: 215). My interest lies in how participants of such groups describe their self-naming choices and which (if any) differences between the two groups arise. Consequently, I have identified a number or divergences in the way the new surnames are appropriated in women's formation of gendered identity, and in the interpretative repertoires employed in constructing their narratives of self-naming.

First of all, this sample demonstrates a wider variety of ways in which Lithuanian women employ the new surname. Differently from the "General Sample", in which only a few cases

of *divorced* women with a surname ending with *-ė* had been encountered, nearly one third of respondents from the "Feminist Sample" reported having a family name that has been shortened after divorce (be it by "neutralizing" the marrital surname or by obtaining a non-suffixed version of the previously owned maiden surname)[264]. Secondly, five women reported that their choice of a non-suffixed surname was not related to marriage and divorce - they have shortened their birth surnames when either they reached a certain age [f5] or their passports were about to expire [f18]. Three have opted for a completely different non-suffixed surname by shortening the maiden surname of their mother or grandmother [f16] [f14]. One respondent, as it has been mentioned, has shortened her marital surname with an ending *-ienė* while still being in marriage [f17]. All the remaining participants from this group have opted for a non-suffixed form of the surname after marriage either as a single family name or hyphenated with their birth surname. While a more extensive discussion regarding self-naming narratives of women who chose the new surname after divorce will be presented later in this thesis, in the subsequent section of this chapter, I would like to inquire into the most common interpretative repertoires presented in the narratives of married women from the "Feminist Sample".

Just like in the "General Sample", a celebration of the possibility to choose [f9][1] a non-suffixed surname due to its aesthetic qualities - as opposed to the "ugly" [f11] and "humiliating" [f4][f11][f15] "patriarchal residue" [f1] that defines an older woman [f1][f12] figuratively embodied by the suffix *-ienė* - is one of the most predominant themes in the narratives presented by respondents. They also choose the shorter surname as a more convenient option when living abroad [f11] as well as due to its brand-like qualities [f14][f1]. Frustration over the fact that Lithuanian women cannot obtain the male version of the surname has also been expressed [f5][f13]. However, differently from the previously discussed "General Sample" narratives, participants from this group clearly articulate feminist sentiments with regard to the gendered inequality ingrained in traditional Lithuanian naming practices. Reiterating criticism communicated by the authors of the surname reform, participants underline the gendered asymmetry of traditional naming as

[264] As it has been noted, this number might be higher due to my explicit interest in this group of women when reaching out to potential participants.

well as problematise the fact that traditional female surnames reveal the marital status of a woman:

> I do not think a woman's surname should demonstrate her marital status. Just like the one of men do not reveal theirs [f16]
>
> I chose this surname for one simple reason - it is nobody's business what my marital status is [f20]
>
> The fact that I chose [xxx]-*ė* instead of [xxx]-*ienė* was purely a feminist move of resistance. I wanted to have the surname of my husband after the marriage, but it was really important to me that my surnames would not demonstrate my marital status. [f10]
>
> To me, an ending -*ienė* demonstrates woman's belonging to the husband [f21]

Supportive attitudes towards non-suffixed naming of daughters as well as a higher number of respondents [all residing in Lithuania] who have actually given a non-suffixed surname to their female children is also one of the most outstanding differences between the two groups that *might* have been conditioned by explicit interest[265]. Differently from rather blunt and simple responses delivered by respondents of the "General Sample", these participants extensively elaborate on the importance of non-suffixed naming of newborn daughters in order to make a real change in Lithuanian female naming practices:

> If I have a daughter, she will definitely be -*ė*. What is the point of me having a non-suffixed surname if I anyway "file" my daughter as -*aitė*? I do not understand the logic of that kind of people. [f6]
>
> Both of my daughters have my surname[266]. The reason is the same [...] it is nobody's business if a woman is married or not. The only problem is that many people do not even know this is at all possible and even if they do - they still give -*aitė,* -*ytė,* -*utė*, etc. [...] [f20]

However, they also demonstrate the awareness that the new surname has over time developed into a signifier denoting yet another form of marital femininities and will hardly

[265] An area of study which, according to scholars of naming generally lacks academic attention (Eshleman and Halley 2016).
[266] It is important to notice a change in rhetorics! Women who have traditionally named daughters usually refer to their daughters carrying the surname of the father. However, those who have non-suffixed family names, refer to 'sharing' their name with their daughters.

reach its political objectives if families insist on giving traditionally suffixed surnames to their daughters:

> The real change would come if it was compulsory for everyone to not use non-suffixed surnames [f20]

> I have liked the idea of [non-suffixed surnames] from the beginning. But it will never be fully accomplished if women will carry on choosing *-ė* surnames upon marriage and still continue to give *-aitė* and *-ytė* to their daughters [f15]

Rachel Thwaites (2017b) as well as other studies into feminists and naming (Mills 2003) (all conducted in the UK) have demonstrated that retaining one's surname upon marriage is widely perceived as representing a feminist identity (Jones et al. 2016; also Laskowski 2010). This fact causes ideological dilemmas to women who, while expected to be aware of "the patriarchal basis of name changing and hence to fight against them [...] find themselves complicit in non-feminist and anti-feminist decision making at times" (Thwaites 2017b: 62). While I am wary of the idea that all participants who responded to my call could be labeled as feminists, their participation in this specific online community and their use of "feminist vocabluaries" (Thwaites 2017b) in discussing their motives of non-traditional self-naming *could* be understood as an articulation of feminist identities. In conducting research into naming practices of women who consider themselves to be feminists, Thwaites has observed that "the only time women who changed their name had to explicitly justify themselves to others was when they had to justify themselves to their feminist community" (2017b; see also Thwaites 2013). Consequently, it must be noted that most of the responses about why women decided to not choose the short version of their own maiden surname (use the non-suffixed version of their birth surname upon marriage) were co-constructed or, as Plummer would call it, coerced (in Budgeon 2008: 302) by my follow up questions during the interview process. While respondents from the "General sample" were responding to the question "Which surname options did you consider while choosing the surname?", with the "Feminist Sample" I consistently inquired further into the reasons of their choice of the non-suffixed surname of the husband. So it is mostly during these follow up discussions that a list of justifications regarding their "non-feminist" decision making have been formulated. I would argue that the awareness of the participants of the controversial nature of their

choice (especially in the context of their interaction with me as someone who belongs to their, albeit virtual, "feminist community") asks for elevaled discursive vigilance when describing their seemingly anti-feminist practices.

Thwaites has observed that choice feminist rhetorics serves as a major discursive repository in feminists' accounts as it "provides women with a sense of empowerment and agency in all their decision-making" (Thwaites 2017b: 63). Narratives of Lithuanian feminist women who have opted for a controversial non-suffixed family name also construct empowered and agentic subjectivities based on the notion of a free choice when discussing their unconventional family names[267]. However, traditional Lithuanian naming practices impose a double edged gendered asymmetry as they are built on patrilineal expectations *as well as* semantically disclose a woman's situated relationality to certain male figures - usually either her father or her husband. As has been demonstrated so far, women with *-ė* surnames engage with a postfeminist discursive framework in order to establish intelligible marital femininities as a response to their controversial naming choices. However, the patrilineality of their naming practices is hardly ever challenged, as an absolute majority of women contacted during this study opt for the neutral version of their husband's surnames either as a single family name or in combination with their birth surname. Likewise, even though participants from the "Feminist Sample" ellaborate on the gender inequality engrained through the use of traditional female suffixes, they - too - predominantly opt for a non-suffixed surname of their spouse. The ambivalence that is created by the simultaneous existence of two rather divergent discourses - egalitarian and conservative (Lazar in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 94) - is performatively glossed over by a list of what one would call compensatory repertoires. Consequently, presumably aware of "the patriarchal basis of a name change" (Thwaites 2017b: 62), they rely on notions of pragmatism, aesthetic preference, feminist egalitarian family values, and a critique of the inescapable relationality of traditional naming practices in discussing the normativity of their marital names.

Traditionalist discourse of following patrilineal custom out of respect to the husband and his family is expanded by discursive constructions delivered by respondents from the "Feminist

[267] "I do not think that a change of surname makes you less of a feminist. This is a truly personal choice, personal freedom". Rugilė. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

Sample". In their narratives of self-naming, the choice of a non-suffixed surname is justified using rhetorical constructions of a heteronormative couple as a union, a team of two functioning under the same "title". Differently from the earlier discussed repertoire of romantic union, separated from extended families and especially the *types* of feminine identities they accommodate, participants from this sample employ feminist vocabularies of egalitarian feminist values (Rom and Benjamin 2011):

> I was charmed by the idea for a family - like a team - to have a title. [...] I saw my husband as my partner and never wanted to be just a derivative product, like an omelette made out of an egg [f6]

> I was absolutely not afraid of the fact that I chose the surname of my husband and gave up my old surname. To me, this is a cute gesture when getting a shared title of the family [f10]

> I like it when the family is a UNIT [...] I decided that if I get married, put on the ring, so we join our surnames and symbolically we turned two people into one unit when it comes to family [f20] (original emphasis)

In researching the reasons for patrilineal naming practices among self-labeled feminists, Eshleman and Halley have concluded that "respondents [...] seemed to want to justify their own patronymic decisions as special cases, working to maintain feminist ideology" (2016: 226). Similarly, the pragmatism of choosing the husband's surname as a better sounding, more beautiful and easier to write *title* of the family is also one of the discursive strategies women employ in calibrating (Cairns and Johnston 2015) the ideological discrepancy of their self-naming stories:

> First of all, my maiden surname is simply awful [f20]

> I used to get very nervous because people would always write my maiden surname with mistakes [...] I quickly got used to my new surname and I am very pleased that, now, it is enough to say it once [f6]

> My maiden surname was very difficult, people always made mistakes when writing it down [f10]

> I did not like my old maiden surname [f11]

> My long and complicated surname was a real burden when living and studying abroad [f19]

Marie Maclean has argued that "[t]he assumption that women change their names upon marriage reflects social and cultural suppositions as to the dependent and relational nature of women's lives. Women thus bear labels announcing to whom they belong: father or husband" (in Eichner 2014: 660). Responding to the critique regarding their choice to follow patrilineal marital naming traditions, women often respond that female birth surnames - too - do not belong to them as they inherit them from their fathers[268]. Consequently, the "relational nature of women's lives" (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660) is also invoked in narratives of women from the "Feminist Sample" as yet another way to justify the ambivalence of their naming choices:

> I would have maybe kept my maiden surname upon marriage if that surname was precious to me. But my relationship with my father was really bad at the time, and I did not want to have his surname [f21]

> I did not consider [keeping my birth surname]. Due to very personal reasons - I feel no sentiments to my father and so I did not think it is worth keeping his surname (even though I really like it) [f4]

Consequently, among *all* the participants interviewed in both groups, only one woman has kept her maiden surname upon marriage, but gave non-suffixed family names of her husband to both of her daughters. Confirming the notion observed by naming scholars that daughters of "surname keepers" are more likely to keep their birth surname upon marriage (Johnson and Scheuble 1995), she declares not even having considered a change of a surname:

> I did not contemplate even for a minute neither *-ė,* nor *-ienė.* It [changing the surname] goes against my personal beliefs as well as our family traditions. My sister also kept her surname. Even my great grandmother had a hyphenated surname, so did my aunt. My parents were extremely happy to hear I am keeping my birth surname. [...] I considered giving my own surname to our children, but my husband reacted very emotionally to this. As I did not want any arguments, I told him that - if we give them his surname - it has to be the *short* one. He really liked this idea [f15]

[268] Donata. Comment on "Kodėl moterys ima vyro pavardę?" *Nebegeda.lt,* 11 Jan. 2019, www.nebegeda.lt/kodel-moterys-ima-vyro-pavarde/ [accessed 15 Feb. 2019]

Indeed, it could be argued that a critical feminist agenda serves as a discursive framework in performative narratives of non-traditional self-naming produced by respondents belonging to the "Feminist sample" as 1) they employ more diverse ways in constructing their social identities, thus extending a list of "inhabitable female subjectivities" (Ringrose and Walkerdine in Taylor 2012); 2) their self-naming narratives rely on feminist vocabluaries of gender inequality ingrained within traditional Lithuanian practices, as well as 3) offer more egalitarian reframing of patrilineal family naming discourse. Finally, 4) they encourage the idea of non-suffixed female surnames to be used when naming female newborns. However, their self-naming choices are nevertheless constructed on a patrilineal pedagogy that supports the male privilege of the constancy of his social identity (Eichner 2014: 660). Importantly, regardless of the critical nature of their narratives, self-naming choices of these women support the idea that the new surname - rather than eliminating marital status of a woman - continues to exist within contemporary Lithuanian society as a new linguistic form in constructing marital femininities.

Women after divorce

As it has been discussed in Part I of this thesis, the Ricoeurian understanding of narrative identity introduces a temporalized dimension of human experience and sees self-identity as "the self that has unity that is bound to change through time" (McNay 1999a: 319). Additionally, McNay has emphasized that the narrative dimension of gendered identity inevitably imposes "the active and constraining presence of the past within the present in so far as the living-through of gender norms constantly reinscribes them upon the body" (1999a: 318). The body hence operates as an inescapable "narrative horizon" (Weiss 2003) as we aim to reconcile multiple spatiotemporally situated identities in constructing intelligible stories of selfhood. I would argue that nowhere is this complex interplay between "the relational nature of women's lives" (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660) and the temporal - or narrative - dimension of social identity more clearly expressed than in the narratives of self-naming provided by Lithuanian divorced women.

As yet another point of crisis (Pilcher 2016), divorce exposes "women's dependency on their partners for the production of their appropriate femininity" (Cancian in Rom and Benjamin 2011: 93) and obliges those who have previously changed their birth name into that of their husband to reconsider their new social persona (du Gay in Watson 2008) and to reconcile it with their narrative identity (Ricoeur 1991) in order to reestablish the intelligibility of their social identity within their communities of practice. Maintaining semantic bonds with their children and, thus repositioning themselves as the *mother* rather than the *wife*, is one of the ways these new orientations towards the future are being secured:

> The main factor that helped me decide were the surnames of my children, I wanted to share my surname with them so we could be all called by the same name [f8]

> When divorcing my husband, I decided that I do not want to keep the surname of a married woman. But at the same time, I did not want to distance myself from my son. I felt that by going back to my maiden surname I would feel bad as if I had betrayed him or something like that… I decided to shorten my surname and share the stem of the surname with my son. So that is how I became [xxx]-ė. Now, after so many years and my son is a grown up man, this decision of mine looks ridiculous. [Keeping my maiden surname] would have not meant that we have a weak bond, that I am a worse mother for leaving him "in the other family" [f2]

One must acknowledge that - due to the discriminatory nature of Lithuanian patrilineal naming practices - a big part of society holds rather ruthless attitudes towards *mothers* who have surnames ending with *-aitė, -ytė, -utė* as they are usually seen as embodying inappropriate female subjects who had children when out of wedlock. A powerful example of the fact that mothers are still very much conditioned by these attitudes was delivered by a mother of three children who all share a rare genetic disease. In 2012, Ramunė Šliuožaitė started speaking publicly about the critical condition of her youngest daughter - then, ten years old - as she was struggling to receive state support in receiving much needed, but very expensive drugs that would improve the health of her child[269]. She admits that her decision to seek publicity had been influenced by the passivity of state clerks in understanding the gravity of the situation. However, she was soon faced with a wave of hostility she claims to

[269] Lukošiūtė, Sandra. "Kliūtis gyvenime - mergautinė pavardė." *Kl.lt,* Aug. 25, 2012, www.diena.lt/naujienos/klaipeda/miesto-pulsas/kliutis-gyvenime-mergautine-pavarde-587376 [accessed 10 Jan 2019]

have received from the people due to her maiden surname: "some people reproached her for the lack of responsibility as she had given birth to three children affected by the same genetic disease *out of wedlock*. There were also allegations she had had all three of her children by different fathers"[270]. Scholars analysing the prevailing good mother ideology have observed that mothers are only valued when they "produce socially valuable children" (Lalvani 2011). Additionally, in the eyes of her critics, the social respectability of this woman is diminished by a lack of a marital surname that would "verify" her appropriate femininity (Rom and Benjamin 2011). As she admitted to one of the media outlets, she had been shocked by the fact that people seem to care more about her surname than about help for her sick children[271]. She also explains she decided to retrieve her maiden surname after her ex-husband (and the father of the three children) had shown no interest in his children and the crisis the family was facing[272].

Giddens has admitted that the fragility of our identities lies within the potential multiplicity of our biographies (1991: 54) and the case of this mother demonstrates how certain meta-narratives or meta-biographies can be extracted from a surname of a woman when she is positioned within wider networks of social relations. That is, "[w]henever we hear a name, we unconsciously place the person, who owns it, in relation to local social hierarchies, assigning him/her a position between the centre and the margins. In this process, the name serves as a basis for the evaluation of what is normative and prestigious, or else awkward and stigmatized" (Rom and Benjamin in Madziva 2018: 941). In the case of Ramunė Šliuožaitė, a story of a single mother of three seriously ill children had been transcribed into a story of a mother who has failed according to gendered criteria of good citizenship (Rom and Benjamin 2012). Consequently, given the level of precariousness certain suffixes can bring upon mothers who carry "maiden" surnames, it is not surprising that women face a list of ideological dilemmas when their marriages end:

A sense of detachment from their birth surname or, more precisely, an incarnation of certain gendered identity that belongs to the past and produces a sense of contradictory embodiment

[270] Ibid.
[271] Ibid.
[272] Ibid.

(Connell in Pilcher 2016) is also often presented as one of the reasons women seek alternative naming practices post-divorce:

> This surname-changings brings me a headache. The surname I had inherited from my father was not beautiful. I was married, changed to *-ienė* [...] I retrieved my maiden surname after divorce, but received comments that I should have stayed *-ienė* as being *-ytė* with a child is not appropriate[273]

> I started thinking about the surname issue during the divorce process. I understood that I do not want to be *-ienė* because that is not what I am anymore. I considered my maiden surname, but felt very distant from it [f8]

> I had been intending to give up my husband's surname after divorce. [...]*utė* - my maiden surname - brings out associations with my childhood and did not seem like a proper option for a grown up person. Also, my decision on [adding *-ė* to my maiden surname] was influenced by my unwillingness to reveal my social status [f7]

> Many divorced women face the same problem: it feels as if it is not right to name oneself with a surname of a person with whom all connections are lost. But one does not want to go back to her maiden surname which she had used when she was a child being of mature age. I have retrieved the neutral form of my parents' surname[274]

> I did not want to keep my husband's surname after divorce. But Aurylaitė belongs to the past[275]

Looking at these accounts, one can see how the neutral surname is employed as a performative response to the inchoate tension (Johnson and Johnson 2015) activated by the broken bonds of relationality and the ephemeral nature of Lithuanian female surnames which - by robbing women of the possibility to maintain stable social identity - fractures their lives into (sometimes multiple) temporalities represented in and through biologically aging, gendered bodies. One could argue that women who have chosen the *-ė* surname upon marriage experience fewer ideological dilemmas related to this inchoate tension when undergoing divorce as they seem to be less likely to opt for a surname change when their bonds of relationality are broken. Even under circumstances when their ex-husbands

[273] Du Vardai. Comment on "Vyriška pavardė būsimai žmonai." *Uzdarbis.lt*, 23 Sept. 2019, www.uzdarbis.lt/t411926/vyriska-pavarde-busimai-zmonai/ [accessed 20 Feb. 2019]
[274] Laima Vengalė in Valevičienė, Daiva. "Ponia pageidauja pono pavardės." *Kauno diena,* 9 Aug. 2005, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/ponia-pageidauja-pono-pavardes.d?id=7252585 [accessed Oct. 18, 2013]
[275] Spundzevičienė, Giedrė. "Naujos moterų pavardės maskuoja šeiminę padėtį." *Gimtasis Rokiškis,* 8 March 2008, p.5.

threaten to retrieve their family names after divorce [f1], most women in my sample with an *-ė* surname insisted on keeping it when the marriage was over. Consequently, one could argue that this tendency suggests the potential of the new surname to establish a certain level of rigidity and resistance against the transitory nature of patrilineal surnames.

Interestingly, most of the divorced respondents who possess a non-suffixed surname do not discard the possibility of taking another family name in case of a new marriage. For example, following the Ivanova-Zvonkė-Bunkė pattern, a respondent who has kept her short marital surname with an ending *-ė* after divorce is convinced that she would do the same in case she gets married again [f12]. While her support for the surname that does not reveal the marital status of a woman is strong, she does not bring up the option of not changing her surname again if she is ever to start a new family: "If I ever get married again, I would only take the short version [of future husband's surname]" [f12]. Similarly, another respondent who has shortened from *-ienė* to *-ė* after divorcing her husband, has agreed that having to change her surname once again "[...] would be a problem. [...] One thing I know for sure is that I do not want to be *-ienė* under any circumstances" [f8]. One of the respondents - who had an active role in the grassroots movement advocating for an introduction of a non-suffixed surname - claims to have been one of the first women to use her right to obtain a non-suffixed surname in the early 2000. As a divorced woman who still had her marital surname, she returned to her maiden surname, but chose a non-suffixed form of it. As she later remarried, she also added a surname of her second husband next to her 'neutral' one[276]. When speaking about her naming practices, she has expressed her contentment in not having to be *-ienė* and adds that her choice to add the second surname came out of respect to her husband [d6]. Others have admitted that the aesthetic quality of the surname of their future husband would play an important role in their choice: "I would take that of the husband, but only if it was beautiful" [f9].

Narratives, as some have argued, serve as psychosocial zones in which "[m]aterial conditions, discourses and practices interweave with subjectively experienced desires and identities, and people make choices, reconstruct pasts and imagine futures within the range of possibilities open to them" (Andrews et al. 2004). Narratives of women who chose the *-ė*

[276] Her current husband is not Lithuanian so she did not have to decide about the suffix of her second surname;

surname after divorce reveal that female family names operate as contested sites of intensive discursive struggle (Mills 2003) where ideological structures, cultural assumptions and subjective desires - inseparable from biologically aging bodies - serve as resources in doing identity work (Taylor and Littleton 2006). What I find fascinating, if not confusing, in the narratives of these women is how short lived and transitional the symbolic and discursive stability of their social identity is when obtaining the new surname in a new marriage. One could go back to the earlier discussed narrative of a respondent who, having an already neutral birth surname due to its Slavic background, described having nightmares and tortured dilemmas about which surname to obtain after marriage [e6]. As she finally opts for an *-ė* ending, goes through divorce, retrieves her maiden surname with an ending *-a,* she admits that deciding on her next marital surname *will be* difficult due to the unusual sound of the surname of her current partner. Consequently, I would argue that an intensive emotional, symbolic and discursive labour in constructing marital and post-marital femininities is often overpowered by patrilineal expectations that function as a structuring meta-narrative (Bruner and Kalmar 1998) in the narratives of most of the women contacted in this study.

I have already ellaborated on the fact that self-naming choices of women are embedded in the notion of romantic love that serves as a future oriented phenomenon charged with heteronormative hopes for stability, security and happiness "perceived as necessary for rearing children" (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 156). Also, it has been observed that women extensively rely on the "good mother" discourse in justifying the traditionalism of their naming practices, as following patrilineal expectations is overwhelmingly understood as a mother's responsibility to provide a symbolic protection for her children (Rom and Benjamin 2011: 118). A telling example of how marital name choices serve as performative speech acts that hold a promise for the future and stability, but, in turn, fracture the life of a woman into - sometimes multiple - gendered temporalities is delivered within the narrative of another divorced woman who took the *-ė* surname at the time of her first marriage:

> I wanted to have a surname with a neutral ending which would not show that I am married [...] I would have maybe kept my maiden surname upon marriage if that surname was precious to me. But my relationship with my father was really bad at the time, and I did not want to have his surname. [...] My final decision was influenced by my wish to have the same surname that me and my husband decided to give to our children. [...] My husband also changed his surname after marriage, he has

> shortened his surname from [xxx]*avičius* to [...]*as*. I became [xxx]*ė,* two of my daughters also [xxx]*ė*[277] and our son [xxx]*as*. [f21]

In this case, intensive symbolic labour in constructing a shared family name that would serve as a figurative shield for the imaginative family unit located in the happy and stable heteronormative future had been performed by both partners - this family took the advantage of the possibility to shorten their surname by getting rid of the Slavic suffix. Additionally, the respondent obtained a neutral form of her husband's surname which resulted in sharing an identical surname with two of her daughters, establishing a family name that only possesses different endings connoting grammatical gender of the family name. However, as her first marriage has ended, she intends to change her surname into the *neutral* form of the family name of her current partner. They also gave a traditionally suffixed surname of her husband to their daughter:

> I cannot really explain why my youngest daughter became -*aitė*. We simply chose this way [f21]

One could see how the perceived cultural necessity (McNay 1999b: 177) to maintain the heteronormative imperative by reiterating socio-symbolic norms and practices (Butler 1998: 520) inevitably impedes the performance of gender identities as the gendered subject fails to stabilize the multiplicity of existing subject positions (Smith 1995: 20). In the case described above, the subject position of a proper wife *and* a proper mother who aims to establish a figurative protection and heteronormative stability for her children by following patrilineal expectations is disturbed by the subsequent marriage and the unthinkingness (Thwaites 2017b) of acting upon socio-symbolic and practices such as marital name change. A lack of discursive resources in re-establishing a coherent narrative of the gendered self is compensated by the narrative of a free choice.

As feminist scholars have argued, names represent the most visible form of one's social identity and could be perceived as "the encapsulation of a past and the potential for the future" (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660). Besides embodying gendered, familial, national, and ethnic identities (Pilcher 2016: 771), Lithuanian female surnames also contain the capacity to disclose the embodied temporal dimension of women's social identity as well as deliver cultural meta-narratives of the self (Hearn in Winch 2015) which make certain

[277] Non-suffixed surnames that they currently share with their mother.

narrative sense and can be understood as "acts of consumption [...] which can be made symbolically to tell stories about tastes, relationships (whether real or desired) or social standing" (Seale in Hyvärinen: 2007: 448). As it has been discussed, the creation of individualized, youthful, *brand-like* marital femininities through the use of the new surname serves as "self-conscious construction of meta-narratives or meta-images of the self" (Hearn in Winch 2015: 233).

As self-naming accounts of divorced women reveal, Lithuanian surnames are perceived as containing information about women's biological age, where surnames ending with *-aitė, -ytė, -utė* are often understood as "more suiting" for little girls, and suffixes *-ienė* are associated with older married women. On the other hand, they emphasize the relationality of women's names by explicitly providing information about their connections with different male figures[278], thus imposing a double-edged gender asymmetry where patrilineal expectations are reinforced by explicit semantic categorization. The new surname in the narratives of divorced women mitigates the ambiguity of their new/divorced identity and could be perceived as a means through which a relatively stable gendered identity could be achieved. However, while narratives of divorced women with *-ė* surname form only a small fraction of all the self-naming accounts collected in this study (and thus deserve a more in depth-investigation), one could argue that the potential of resistance against the fleeting nature of patrilineal naming culture is rarely acknowledged by the Lithuanian women as they choose - or intend to choose - family names of their husbands in case of a new marriage, thus reenacting the functional fixedness (Pilcher 2017) of patrilineal naming traditions. In fact, the possibility of re-constructing their social identity from scratch in an aftermath of *crisis points* (Pilcher 2016) is discursively constructed as an enriching life experience - a notion that challenges the idea the the rigidity and stability of one's social identity usually exercised by male subjects within patrilineal naming cultures is something all individuals should be striving to achieve:

[278] This is particularly clear in hyphenated surnames (e.g. *Natalija Bunkė, Daiva Tamošiūnaitė-Budrė, Jurga Jurkutė-Širvaitė, etc.*

> Of course I considered retaining my maiden surname upon marriage, but I have always been tempted by the possibility of a completely new life. I also changed my professional profile and I wanted to stay *incognito* for a while[279]

> I like all kinds of experiences. Now that I am married to Janutas, I kind of started my work as a journalist from the beginning [...] Yes, all the doors were open to Grinevičiūtė[280], but for Janutienė - not anymore! This is an interesting experience and a way to remember the old times, the very beginning of my carrier[281]

However, it could be argued that the potential of the new surname to provide women with a more stable social identity will not be fully exploited by the users of Lithuanian language community as long as the patronymic male privilege functions as a structuring meta-narrative (Bruner and Kalmar 1998) in women's identity work, affecting the structural, the cultural and the subjective dimension of the their narrative identity. Therefore, based on the narratives of self-naming produced by divorced Lithuanian women with *-ė* surnames, I argue that naming choices of contemporary Lithuanian women could be understood as spatiotemporally situated speech acts inescapably related to the materiality of the body, that function as liminal spaces between the incorporated knowledge of the past and hopeful orientations towards a stable future and are "bound to change through time" (McNay 1999a: 319).

Discussion

Constructed around paradigms of *personal choice, aesthetic preferences, heterosexual imaginary*, and *global dispositions*, narratives of non-traditional female marital naming presented by the participants from the "General Sample" - as well as interviewees within the Lithuanian media - demonstrate how female subjectivities are positioned within a distinct psychosocial zone (Andrews et al. 2004) where the *self* is affected by the knowledge/practice regime of neoliberal individualism (McAvoy 2015: 25). However, not

[279] Greta Akcijonaitė. In Vozbutaitė, Jolanta. "Kokią pavardę renkasi ištekėjusios moterys?" *Moteris.lt,* 11 May 2009, www.moteris.lt/psichologija/kokia-pavarde-renkasi-istekejusios-moterys.d?id=59664265 [accessed 19.11.2013]
[280] Her birth surname.
[281] Rūta Janutienė. Ibid.

only do they construct a neoliberal kind of subjectivity that celebrates the self as an autonomous and self-choosing agent (McAvoy 2015). They also shed light on the psychic life (Scharff 2015) of the neoliberal subject. That is how power and technologies of subject formation inform and "become internalized" (McAvoy 2015) to such an extent that it influences affective experiences, such as, for example, experiences of beauty or disgust.

I have observed how the assertive and confident narrative of *personal choice* that women triumphantly employ in discussing their non-traditional marital naming celebrates the construction of postfeminist subjectivities that are nevertheless embedded in such technologies of the self (Foucault 1988) as patrilineal marital naming practices. Engaging the work of gender scholars who employ the notion of postfeminism as an analytic category for cultural critique (Litosseliti et al. 2019) has been extremely useful in providing a macro, critical approach to a range of discursive repertoires that I see as forming the paradigm of aesthetic preferences. Though situated in a localized historical temporality and related to a distinct sociolinguistic question, narratives of Lithuanian women produce constructions of beauty informed by postfeminist knowledge/practice regimes that value youthful individualized heteronormative femininity and mobilizes animosity towards "older or bigger women who are subject to abusive representations" (Gill 2007: 9). So much so that, for some, an internalization of postfeminist preoccupation with beauty - rather than the political aspect of patronymic naming practices - manifests itself in a repetitive narrative about the ugliness of the traditionally suffixed surname represented by a much disliked mother-in-law.

Along the same lines, their narratives shed light on the importance of the name-body relationship (Pilcher 2016) as surnames are perceived as possessing the power to embody youthful luminosities (McRobbie in Gill 2017: 615) in opposition to the old, dull and unappealing traditionally [sur]named bodies of older women. Consequently, given the individualized and consumerist discourse employed by women in describing the process of surname acquisition, non-traditional [sur]names could be seen as certain objects or commodities that - "ordered in relation to the body" (Seale 2004) - make certain narrative sense and, thus, can be seen as "acts of consumption [...] which can be made symbolically to tell stories about tastes, relationships (whether real or desired) or social standing" (Seale in Hyvärinen: 2007: 448). Or, to put it another way, situated performative speech acts (Austin

1962) that establish neo-traditional marital femininities. Importantly, misogynist postfeminist discourses that are closely tied to the ageing female body could be seen as operating as certain connectivities through which postfeminist culture travels transnationally enabling "contextual and contradictory, localized, and hybrid interpretations, as well as new cultural formations and subject positions" (Dosekun 2015: 966).

One could argue that the capacity of the [sur]name to embody certain/prefered femininities is even more realized in the times of intensive use of the Internet and identity construction through the means of digital communication and, most importantly, participation in specific online communities. The field of onomastics is only starting to explore the versatile use of personal and user names within the Internet culture (Hämäläinen 2013). I would argue that, within the context of growing digital and media communication, the name often precedes the body and, thus, establishes distinct visible identities (Alcoff 2006) that construe meta-narratives or meta-images of the gendered self (Hearn in Winch 2015: 233). One of the respondents referred to this phenomenon while describing her symbolic power struggles with customers who - before meeting her in person - would hold certain prejudice based on her maiden name: "[W]hen I had my maiden surname, I tried to even dress in a certain way in order to look older because people - mostly men - would arrive with certain preconceptions as they assumed they had been dealing with a young girl" [a7]. Therefore, besides providing information regarding one's gender, ethnic or marital identities, traditionally suffixed surnames in Lithuania are also perceived as having the capacity to indicate women's biological age or, to quote the authors of the controversial Petition, to "reflect the characteristics of [women's] age" (in Miliūnaitė 2013: 351).

Consequently, one could argue that women's narratives of non-traditional marital self-naming indicate a discursive struggle (Mills 2003) to expand the repertoire of inhabitable female subjectivities (Ringrose and Walkerdine in Taylor 2012) by creating feminine identities that are positioned in a liminal space between the youthfulness of a single woman and the social respectability of marital femininity as "[b]eing partnered remains crucial to women's ability to become viable (and visible) subjects" (Taylor 2012: 3). This phenomenon hints to a certain type of liminality and controversy that - as Taylor has described - is symptomatic of the whole postfeminist culture: "the contemporary single

woman is allowed, endorsed, even celebrated; yet simultaneously disavowed as that which must be pitted, scorned, and emptied of her oppositional potential. That is, the contradictions and tensions that I am mapping around the figure of the single woman are indicative of the contradictions and tensions that are constitutive of postfeminism itself" (Taylor 2012: 13).

In part II of this study, I have inquired into the sporadic historical discussions surrounding the suffix problem in twentieth century Lithuania that, on many levels, correspond with attacks on nineteenth century spinsters in the Western European context (Taylor 2012: 2). That is, traditional suffixes *-aitė, -ytė or -utė* that surnames of unmarried women usually contain were seen by contemporary women of intelligentsia as impeding their ability to establish respectful social personas. However, looking at contemporary discussions in relation to the non-traditional surnames of women, a dramatic attention shift from the *single woman* to the *married woman* can be observed as women's narratives hardly ever refer to single femininities and, as it has been demonstrated, non-suffixed family names are widely perceived as a phenomenon closely related to the marriage institution. The fact that surnames of Lithuanian married women have turned into a domain of intensive resignification of marital female identities is also manifested by the variety of naming options that can be observed within the public domain; 1) traditionally suffixed with *-ienė*, 2) traditionally suffixed with *-ienė*, but hyphenated with birth name, 3) non-suffixed with ending *-ė*, 4) non-suffixed with ending *-ė*, but hyphenated with birth surname, 5) non-suffixed marital names of slavic origin, and 6) birth surnames hyphenated with surname of foreign origin. All of these possible options of female marital naming, besides pointing to the ethnic heterogeneity of Lithuanian linguistic community, first and foremost signify that the realm of marital femininities is undergoing an intensive process of ideological and cultural renegotiation. Consequently, I would argue that, within the self-naming narratives of contemporary Lithuanian women, postfeminist discourse serves as a cultural repository of discursive resources in order to explain, justify and make intelligible the changing attitudes towards the social persona of a married woman.

Transnational postfeminist femininities

While discussing an emergence of new femininities in the early 1990s South Korea, cultural analyst JongMi Kim inquired into the term *Missy* used as a new way to define young married women (2013). Inevitably influenced by the global media and neoliberal consumerist technologies, *Missy* is unimaginable without the abject other - *Adjumma* - seen as embodying an old domesticated married femininity. Traditionally used to describe married or older women (or housewives), this category now refers to "'audacious', 'unconsidered', 'unashamed' and 'ignorant' femininities [...] often represented with short, permed hair, tattooed eyebrows and clown-like make-up" (JongMi Kim 2013: 157). Due to the enthusiastic response from young housewives, subsequent beauty and media products further developed the character of *Missy,* "challenging the traditional de-sexualization and domestication of married women" (Gill and Scharff 2011: 8). Interestingly, repeatedly exposed to the character of *Missy,* young married South Korean women are embracing this gendered phenomenon through a list of visual and social practices in order to attain the look of an unmarried woman - *Agassi* - equated to "an attractive, sexy and youthful identity" (JongMi Kim 2013: 152).

Married identities of women are often tied to maternal femininities. And while the South Korean *Missy* seems to be embedded in "transformed gendered individualization" (McRobbie 2009: 100) of traditional domesticated femininities of a housewife, scholars of postfeminist media culture in the UK have argued that the role "of the middle-class mother who is slim and youthful in appearance" (McRobbie 2014: 119) is central to the neoliberal project of reproducing class society (McRobbie 2013: 119). As it has been discussed, these independent and flexible maternal femininities in the UK's mainstream media are labeled as *yummy mummies*, often juxtaposed with abject *slummy mummies*, represented by the *pathetic* and *needy* working class motherhood (Winch 2015: 243). A tendency that, according to scholars of neoliberal maternal identities, has intensified with the presence of celebrity motherhood or "glamorous neotraditionalism" (Martínez-Jiménez et al. 2018).

Scholars of transnational postfeminism (as well as analysts of postsocialist neoliberalism) have argued against an understanding of postfeminist sensibility as a unidirectional

movement of gendered neoliberalism as mobile rationality (Ong 2006) that travels from West to rest (Dosekun 2015; also Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016). Instead, they encourage an inquiry into what multiple hybrid formations (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 211) appear when postfeminist rationality finds affinity (not equivalence) with different situated traditions, practices and discourses (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 220). As the above mentioned examples demonstrate, postfeminist celebrations of entrepreneurial, youthful, body-oriented heteronormative femininities find affinity within very different socio-historical landscapes. In contemporary South Korean gendered regimes, it connects with discourses that repudiate domesticated and de-sexualized traditional married femininities. In the popular culture of contemporary UK, an individualized and independent subject of gendered neoliberalism finds its affinity with privileged middle-class (maternal) femininities. Similarly, in postsocialist Russian best selling self-help literature, postfeminism is domesticated (Alassutari in Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015) by transcoding (Hall 2011) a Soviet ideological discourse of work on one's personality (*rabota nad saboi*) into a neoliberal project of femininity that requires simultaneous labor on one's personality, femininity, and sexuality, thus establishing semantic affinity between the Soviet *working woman* (Ratilainen 2012) and the postfeminist working girl (McRobbie 2009, Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 96). Inevitably, postsocialist representations of economized (Brown 2016) femininity produces a list of abject others that, in the case of postsocialist Russian psy-literature, are embodied by the figure of a self-sacrificing mother robbed of the pleasure of sex and consumption (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015). However, the new normative feminine subjects are only made intelligible through their participation in the structures of heterosexual relationships (Salmenniemi and Adamson 2015: 95).

Similarly, narratives of self-naming in postsocialist Lithuania domesticate postfeminist rationality as a discursive strategy in constructing neotraditional femininities informed by contemporary transnational gender regimes that value youthful, self-dependent, body-oriented femininities only fully realized and made valuable through their participation in what Bella DePaulo has described as heterohormative matrimania (DePaulo in Taylor 2012: 24). Postfeminist promotion of aesthetic entrepreneurship (Elias et al. 2017) that starts with branded meta-images located within the gendered body (Winch 2015), but also extends to subjectivity and psychic life (Elias et al. 2017: 16) where the subsequent production of

fear of a) fat (Cairns and Johnston 2015) and b) ageing bodies (Organ and De Benedictis 2015) is realized within naming narratives through the repudiation of old-fashioned, dull, domesticated and aesthetically unappealing women often described by a misogynist term *boba*. However, as Pierre Bourdieu has put it, "[T]he body is in the social world, but the social world is in the body" (in Shilling 2004: 473). Or, following Bodenhorn and Vom Bruck, named bodies are manifestations of incorporated knowledge and as such have their own historicity (2006: 20). I would argue that references to older women often embodied by the figure of the mother-in-law within narratives of non-traditional self naming, besides indicating animosity towards biologically ageing female bodies, also refer to a generation of women who have been inevitably affected by the Soviet gender ideals described by scholars of Soviet gender regime as defined by material scarcity and emphasizing "modesty, simplicity, 'naturalness' and moderate taste" (Rudova in Adamson and Salmenniemi 2017: 304). Consequently, contemporary postfeminist Anglo-American discourse that portrays an older generation of (second-wave) feminists as embodying a lack of playfulness and pleasure (Elias et al. 2017: 1) as well as a "censoriousness and strictness" (Donaghue 2017: 138) finds its semantic affinity within postsocialist (postcolonial) narratives of self-naming where the generation of *the past* is represented by traditionally surnamed ageing women - a culturally and ideologically overburdened "semantic field" (Weiss 2003: 34) connoting the Soviet femininity, symbolically epitomized by the traditional suffix *-ienė*. Importantly, as this culturally and politically overburdened femininity is often seen as represented by the very concrete bodies of the mother-in-law, I would argue that traditionally (sur)named identities serve as an important symbol in relation to both *micro* and *macro* temporalities that *affect* contemporary Lithuanian femininities.

The affective dimension of marital naming

Up until now, I have been asking Foucauldian - or, more broadly, discursive - questions in relation to the role of *affect* in the power and technologies of subject formation in order to understand how certain intensities "are bound to subjecthood and how power operates through and mobilises effect" (Elias et al. 2017: 17). In my analysis of the aesthetic dimension of narratives of self naming, I have demonstrated how postfeminist gender regimes (McRobbie 2009) in postsocialist environment form a cultural repository of

discursive resources through which *the political, the embodied, and the affective* (McAvoy 2015: 22) dimensions of female subjectivity are being constructed, resulting in multiple historically situated "hybrid formations" (Kangas and Salmenniemi 2016: 211).

However, lately, feminist scholars of Deleuzian or non-representational approach have been asking important questions regarding "embodied affective processes" (Coleman and Figueroa in Elias et al. 2017: 17). For example, responding to the growing feminist interest in theories of beauty, Coleman and Moreno Figueroa argue for an understanding of beauty not only as content but also as an embodied social, cultural and economic *process* (2010: 358). Using the work of feminist and affect scholars, they theorize beauty as an "affective aesthetic feeling" that escapes its common "organisation into an industry which serves a particular set or interests" (361). Consequently, based on their empirical work and conceptions of beauty that appear in their research, they examine beauty as hope: "as temporal processes of displacement to the past and of deferral to the future" (Coleman and Moreno Figueroa 2010: 358). Beauty, they argue, while communicated in the present, is defined by its failure *to be* in the present and rather characterizes as a bodily inclination or tendency "not located *in* anything (as content) but a process which *exists* and *is produced through* the relations between bodies, things, memories, dreams and hopes" (Coleman and Moreno Figueroa 2010: 361).

I would argue that this Deleuzian reconceptualisation of *beauty as hope* serves as a productive tool in re-reading the narratives of self-naming by contemporary Lithuanian women. I have argued that traditional Lithuanian female naming practices are perceived as having the capacity to indicate - albeit symbolically - women's biological age. And narratives of divorced women - more than any other testimonies of self-naming - reveal how much this linguistic practice fragments the life of a woman into separate and, sometimes, irreconcilable temporalities. On the other hand, feminist scholarship into the politics of happiness has suggested that the promissory logic of happiness is built on the idealisation of marriage (Ahmed in Taylor 2012: 25). I have discussed how the taken-for-grantedness (Carter 2019) of the heteronormative traditionalism of non(neo)-traditional naming practices of Lithuanian women is built on the creation of temporal and symbolic categorizations of us and them and before and after. And that the celebration of individualized romantic

coupledom is perceived as a hopeful promise of a happy future. I have also concluded that the patronymic male privilege functions as a structuring pedagogy in women's self-naming practices that supports the idea of women's lives as inevitably fractured into different and sometimes multiple temporalities habitually imposed by woman's situated relationality to various male figures. Consequently, building on the notion of beauty as hope and on the ideological configuration of marriage as a domain of happiness, women's choices of a more beautiful version of a marital name could be understood as bodily inclinations (Coleman and Moreno Figueroa 2010) towards a hopeful/happy temporality affiliated to the institution of marriage.

Lauren Berlant has described bodily inclinations or tendencies as an impulse that "as yet has no content" (in Coleman and Figueroa 2010) and Coleman and Figueroa follow up by reframing beauty as a "bodily inclination; not located in anything (as content) but a process which exists as and is produced through the relations between bodies, things, memories, dreams and hopes" (2010: 361). Symbolic and linguistic transitions that women are expected to perform by following patrilineal expectations function as a linguistic right of passage that symbolically transports women into a hopeful temporality contingent upon stability, security and heteronormative happiness. However, as narratives of Lithuanian women reveal, this new hopeful temporality is often *hijacked* by traditionally [sur]named bodies and defines an ageing femininity that participants of this study describe as *abject* female bodies that activate feelings of animosity and contempt.

Consequently, their hopes for a happy and stable future are interrupted as this temporality is already seen as occupied by someone else, that is - already filled with *content*. Or, to be more precise, with culturally and ideologically overburdened temporality, where cultural representations of ageing bodies and/or very concrete embodiments of mothers-in-law or ex-wives of the husband robs women of the possibility to imagine or conceive of a happy future. A temporality that gives a sense of being incaged or held down:

> I remember I was really glad that we will not be imprisoned within this *-ienė* ending [e15]

> The surname I received after marriage was weighing me down [f9]

Following this line, the new non-suffixed surname could be anticipated as more beautiful precisely because it lacks cultural content and, thus, serves as a hopeful promise for a happy future:

> I did not want to be [xxx]-*ienė* because my husband was once already married and that woman chose ending -*ienė*. [...] My mother-in-law had been married to the father of my husband and was [xxx]-*ienė*. I thought that in relation to this exact surname, suffix -*ienė* cannot be considered because both of [xxx]-*ienė* experienced divorce. [...] My husband was pleased because I chose HIS[282] surname and had never been married to [xxx]-*ė*, only to [xxx]-*ienė* [e4]

So a postcolonial desire to construct neo-traditional marital femininities that mimic Western patrilineal naming patterns - besides serving as a symbolic strategy in navigating multiple communities of practice for transnationally positioned women - is perceived as a way to reimagine heteronormative marital femininity. One of the ways this is achieved through repositioning the new marital identity as establishing a new form of belonging to the individualized romantic union of two, thus, symbolically maintaining the intelligibility of the new practice as well as detaching marital femininities from other female figures of extended family (or ex-wives of the husband). On the other hand, women's extensive engagement with discursive paradigms of *individual choice, aesthetic preference, heterosexual imaginary* and *global dispositions* suggests that, in postsocialist Lithuania, postfeminist sensibility provides a list of cultural representations that serve as alternative frameworks of intelligibility through which new forms of marital identities can be imagined.

Conclusions

In Part I of this study, I laid out the main research question of this thesis: *How do women who have obtained the non-traditional surname make sense of their choices?* I was particularly interested in 1) which cultural and discursive resources they use to recover a legitimate place in common memberships (Seale 2004), and 2) how they reconcile the new social persona (du Gay in Watson 2009) in relation to their narrative identity (Ricoeur 1991). In order to analyse public and private narratives of women with a non-suffixed surname, this

[282] Emphasis in original;

study has drawn on the body of work established by scholars of narrative inquiry, as well as feminist theories of embodiment, methodological tools offered by practitioners of discursive narrative approach, recent theoretical contributions developed by sociologists of naming (on the relationship between names, bodies and identity), and growing contributions from international analysts of postfeminist culture.

As Thwaites has observed, "we often find satisfaction in the norms which make people understandable and acceptable within [...] society" (2017b). I argue that the multiplicity of forms of marital self-naming that Lithuanian women embrace[283] (in contrast to men who commonly preserve their social identity by maintaining a surname received at birth (Eichner 2014)), as well as the extensive list of discursive resources they engage with in narrating their self-naming stories, reaffirms the notion that an establishment of intelligible social identities in the times of "de-traditionalising tendencies of late capitalism" (McNay 1999a: 315). In turn, it asks for an intensive symbolic labour and turns female family names into sites of struggle (Mills 2003) in which performative "regulation of socio-symbolic norms and practices" (McNay 1999a: 317) takes place, often, "at multiple stages" (Hecht in Laskowski 2010: 76).

Contrary to my initial assumption that associations with local feminist historicities would inevitably function as the main source of ideological dilemmas in the narratives of women who choose the *new* surname, while analysing my data I have observed that the ideological tension is mostly located around questions of "ambivalent belonging" (Rom and Benjamin 2011). That is, women repeatedly struggle to discursively reposition themselves back into the family, making it possible to argue that the relational nature of women's lives (Maclean in Eichner 2014: 660) inscribed in patrilineal naming conventions functions as a meta-narrative (Bruner and Kalmar 1998) that structures women's engagement with the past and their imaginations of the future in relation to their gendered subjectivity. However, while both an inquiry into narratives of self-naming *as well as* an ethnographic observation of their

[283] As has been demonstrated, the forms of Lithuanian marital femininities include women who keep their surnames, hyphenate their birth surnames with traditionally suffixed family names of their husband, use *neutral* forms of their husband's surname upon marriage *or* hyphenate their birth surnames with those of the neutral forms of their husband's. Cases of hyphenated or single family names consisting of family names belonging to different linguistic communities also amount to a list of marital feminine visibilities, so do exceptional cases of surnames of women who possess a *masculine* form of their husband's family name.

actual naming choices makes it possible to argue that the patrilineal expectations embedded within the Lithuanian naming practices generally have remained undisturbed after an introduction of the non-suffixed surname, an intensive cultural renegotiation of the notion of marital femininity can be observed. Lois McNay has argued that the opportunity for a creative dimension of agency is established through an individual's ability to "reconcile multiple and sometimes conflicting meanings" (1999a: 329). The intelligibility - or the coherence and integrity (Freeman 2010) - of these troubled identities (Taylor and Littleton 2006), as has been discussed, is re-established through a list of interpretative repertoires that belong to a cultural repository of what Gill has termed postfeminist sensibility (2007; 2017). Consequently, the usefulness of postfeminist scholarship lies in its ability to serve as an analytic category for cultural critique (Litosseliti et al. 2019) in recognizing historically-situated-yet-patterned subject positions that neoliberal rationality offers to gendered subjects as it travels across borders.

As Bourdieu has argued "[t]he body is in the social world, but the social world is in the body" (in Shilling 2004: 473). The female body, as scholars of contemporary postfeminist culture have observed, serves as a key site where the edges of contemporary femininity are being reformulated (Litosseliti et al. 2019). Following recent contributions in the field of naming studies on the importance of recognizing the name-body-identity nexus in the production of gendered identities (Pilcher 2017; 2016), I have demonstrated that self-naming practices of contemporary Lithuanian women are extensively preoccupied with what various analysts of postfeminist culture have described as a girlification of adult femininity (Dosekun 2015: 972), the celebration of girlie aesthetics (Donaghue 2017: 233), or an intensive self-branding (Winch 2015) through the processes of playful and innovative use of language as a form of symbolic entrepreneurship (Lazar 2017). As Lithuanian narratives of self-naming reveal, an intensified misogyny that Gill has recognized as prevailing within postfeminist media culture (2016) is closely tied to an ageing female body that is also seen as belonging to a different sociopolitical temporality. A body that is a site of (colonial) experience (Oakley in Hogan 2016: 57) and, thus, impedes women's capacity to envision a future promised by dominant Western cultural imaginations of heteronormative marriage as a place of safety, happiness and stability (Ahmed in Taylor 2012). An ageing female body that is not recognized as embodying valuable subjects (Skeggs 2004). The use of the new

surname, thus, could be understood in terms of semiotics of affect (McAvoy 2015: 30), as a response to a culturally overburdened ageing body that activates feelings of animosity and contempt, for it is seen as hijacking the possibility to establish a heteronormative union of just two that holds hopeful promise for a happy future.

To sum up, contrary to the feminist expectations outlined by the authors of the suffix reform, narratives of Lithuanian women who choose non-traditional surnames reveal their extensive preoccupation with what Lazar has called "*I*-feminism" (Lazar in Litosseliti et al. 2019: 1); constructing youthful, modern, empowered and self-choosing heteronormative femininities, imaged on a postcolonial desire to establish global Western femininities distant from ageing, dull and unappealing Soviet feminine identities often embodied by the figure of the mother-in-law. Despite emerging practices of self-naming that could be thought of as extending a list of inhabitable female subjectivities (Ringrose and Walkerdine 2008), mostly related to the family names of divorced Lithuanian women, a feminist initiative to introduce an alternative form of female naming that would not reveal woman's marital status has been generally transcoded (Hall 2011) into a tool of constructing neo-traditional postsocialist femininities, now commonly perceived as connoting marital female identities. This is not to say that this neo-traditional femininity does not cause controversy and punitive consequences. Given how deeply traditionally suffixed female marital identities are imbedded within the hegemonic ethno-linguistic nationalist ideology, owners of the new surname are often exposed to harsh criticism and ridicule, with stark oppositions from members of their husband's extended family who often respond to unconventional marital naming as a violation or mutilation of their family name. This endorses the idea that the notion of appropriate femininity (Rom and Benjamin 2011) in contemporary Lithuania is intertwined with a compulsory perpetuation of Lithuanian language ideology *as well as* patrilocal expectations. However, the symbolic *mutilation* of the traditional women's surnames that the users of non-suffixed marital names are often accused of could be seen as performative practices of figurative *de*colonization of traditional Lithuanian female marital subjectivities. Postfeminist imagination, I would argue, provides a non-contaminated semiotic field through which these new forms of marital femininity can be realized.

Potential directions for future research

As it was constructed using a purposive sampling method, this thesis did not focus on establishing a more extensive investigation into the use of non-suffixed surnames among women belonging to specific demographics. While the study reflects general tendencies in the use of the new linguistic tool as a way to construct female marital identities, the homogeneity of the "General Sample" was partly addressed by putting together a "Feminist Sample". However, I would argue that further research into the role of the new surname with an interest in women belonging to specific demographic groups would serve as an important contribution to the body of knowledge established already. One such group is the transnationally positioned women who - as it has been observed by my analysis - embrace the new surname in order to establish the more intelligible femininities in their places of residence that are mostly dominated by Anglo-Saxon female naming conventions. (Sur)naming practices of daughters born to ethnic Lithuanians who are currently living outside Lithuania should also receive sociological interest. In addition, the naming practices of divorced women - and especially their use of non-suffixed family names - also deserves wider investigation.

Recently, Rachel Robnett (2017) has outlined a number of recommendations in further research on naming practices. She has suggested extending the existing body of knowledge in relation to gay and lesbian relationships. As same-sex marriage or same-sex civil partnership is not yet legal in Lithuania, extensive research into the naming practices of this demographic group is not currently feasible. However, recently, one lesbian couple has creatively employed the non-suffixed *-ė* surname in, first, shortening their family names and, second, by officially obtaining the short surname of the partner as their second name[284], thus, "illegally" constructing a shared family name[285]. Their creative use of the new surname

[284] From being Aurelija Ignotaitė she has become Aurelija Pauksnė Ignotė, where *Pauksnė* is the shortened version of her partner's surname that is now officially recognized as her second name. Accordingly, her partner has transitioned from being Dovilė Paunksnytė to Dovilė Ignotė Paunksnė. It must be noted, however, that not all shortened surnames of women would be officially *accepted* as proper first names and so the two women were *lucky* that their birth surnames, when shortened, were accepted by the State as appropriate names.
[285] Bakūnaitė, Gintarė. "Merginų pora sugalvojo, kaip Lietuvoje 'nelegaliai susituokti'." *Delfi.lt,* Oct. 3, 2019, www.delfi.lt/news/daily/lithuania/merginu-pora-sugalvojo-kaip-lietuvoje-nelegaliai-susituokti.d?id=82287373 [accessed Nov. 3, 2019]

obviously extends a list of *imaginable* female identities and extends a list of femine visibilities associated with the new surname.

I have already discussed that an absence of openly feminist visibilities associated with the new surname might have influenced the list of imaginable feminine identities in contemporary Lithuania. In fact, one self-identified feminist has described her choice of a surname as a strategic act in order to increase the diversity of feminine visibilities related to the new name. Looking at the creative solution of how the new family name can be used in performative constructions of same-sex unions, one could argue that the inevitable legalization of same-sex partnership/marriage in Lithuanian might produce an extended list of feminine visibilities that would function as imaginable gendered embodiments for the rest of society. Moreover, sporadic public appearances of trangender women who have chosen the new surname as a form of social identity[286] are also contributing to extending this list in contemporary Lithuania. Consequently, a longitudinal study of people's attitudes towards the new surname - especially in relation to the imminent appearance of new gendered visibilities - would produce an exciting study into the convergence of language and gender ideologies in historically and temporally localized settings, how they are employed, challenged and subverted as they "move through time and space" (Bucholtz 2003) and, thus, how this convergence conditions the meaning and effect (Omi 1997) of the non-suffixed family name.

[286] Aržuolaitienė, Kristina. "Mes lygūs. Translytė Alisa: „Matuodamasi buvusios žmonos drabužius suvokiau, kad nuo savęs nepabėgsiu." *15min.lt,* Dec. 27, 2018. www.15min.lt/gyvenimas/naujiena/santykiai/mes-lygus-translyte-alisa-matuodamasi-buvusios-zmonos-drabuzius-suvokiau-kad-nuo-saves-nepabegsiu-1024-1078298?copied" [accessed Jun 13, 2019]

Bibliography

Abu-Tabich, Lilian. "On National Collective Rights, Civil Equality and Women's Rights: Palestine Women in Israel and Their (Negated) Right to Choose Their PLace of Residence." *Theory and Criticism: an Israeli Forum,* vol. 34, no. 2, 2009, pp. 43-71.

Adams, Matthew. "The reflexive self and culture: a critique." *The British Journal of Sociology,* vol. 54, no. 2, 2003, pp. 221-238.

Adamson, Maria, and Suvi Salmenniemi. "'The Bottom Line Is That the Problem Is You': Aesthetic Labour, Postfeminism and Subjectivity in Russian Self-Help Literature." *Aesthetic labour: Beauty politics in neoliberalism,* edited by Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill, Christina Scharff, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 301-316.

Ahmed, Sarah. "The Happiness Turn." *New Formations,* vol. 63, 2007, pp. 7-14.

Alasuutari, Pertti. "The Domestication of Worldwide Policy Models." *Ethnologia Europea,* vol, 39, no, 1, 2009, pp. 66-71.

Almack, Kathryn. "What's in a Name? The Significance of the Choice of Surnames Given to Children Born within Lesbian-parent Families." *Sexualities,* vol. 8, no. 2, 2005, pp. 239-254.

Alcoff, Linda Martin. *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self,* Oxford University Press, 2006.

Alford, Richard D. *Naming and Identity: A Cross-cultural Study of Personal Naming Practices*. New Haven, CT: HRAF, 1988. Print.

Alia, Valerie. *Names and Nunavut: Culture and Identity in Arctic Canada*. Berghahn Books, 2007.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso [2nd edition], 1991 (1983).

Andrews, Molly. "Beyond Narrative: The shape of traumatic testimony." Beyond Narrative Coherence/ Studies in Narrative 11, edited by Matti Hyvärinen, Lars-Christer Hydén, Marja Saarenheimo, and Maria Tamboukou, John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2010, pp. 147-167.

Andrews, Molly, Shelley Day Sclater, Corinne Squire, and Amal Treacher. "Introduction." *The Uses of Narrative: Explorations in Sociology, Psychology and Cultural Studies*, edited by Molly Andrews, Shelley Day Sclater, Corinne Squire, and Amal Treacher, Routledge, 2004, pp. 1-11.

Annus, Epp. *Soviet Postcolonial Studies: A view from the Western Borderlands,* Routledge, 2018.

Astalos Morell, Ildikó, and Yulia Gradskova. "The gendered subject of postsocialism: state-socialist legacies, global challenges and (re)building of tradition." Gendering Postsocialism: Old Legacies and New Hierarchies, edited by Yulia Gradskova and Ildikó Asztalos Morell, Routledge, 2018.

Astalos Morell, Ildikó. "A Life of Labor, a Life of Love: Telling the Life of a Young Peasant Mother Facing Collectivization." *And They Lived Happily Ever After: Norms and Everyday Practices of Family and Parenthood in Russia and Central Europe*, edited by Helena Carlbäck, Yulia Gradskova, Zhanna Kravchenko, CEU Press, 2012, pp.

65-85.

Atkins-Sayre, Wendy. "Naming Women: The Emergence of 'Ms.' as a Liberatory Title." *Women and Language,* vol. 28, no. 1, 2005, pp. 8-16.

Austin, John Langshaw. *How to do things with words,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Avdeeva, Anna. *Natural Parenting in Russia: when 'nature' meets kinship,* University of Helsinki, Doctoral dissertation, 2020.

Baker, Joanne. "The ideology of choice. Overstating progress and hiding injustice in the lives of young women: Findings from a study in North Queensland, Australia." Women's Studies International Forum, vol. 31, no. 1, 2008, pp. 53-64.

Balkelis, Tomas. *The Making of Modern Lithuania*. Routledge, 2009.

Baločkaitė, Rasa. "On Ideology, Language, and Identity: Language Politics in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Lithuania." *Language Policy*, vol. 13, 2014, pp. 41-61.

Baločkaitė, Rasa. "Between mimesis and non-existence. Lithuania in Europe, Europe in Lithuania." Kultūros barai, 2008. www.eurozine.com/between-mimesis-and-non-existence/ [accessed Apr. 2020]

Bamberg, Michael G. W., Anna De Fina, and Deborah Schiffrin. "Introduction to the volume." *Selves and Identities in Narrative and Discourse*, edited by Michael G. W. Bamberg, Anna De Fina, and Deborah Schiffrin. John Benjamins Publishing, 2007, pp. 1-9.

Banet-Weiser, Sarah, Rosalind Gill, and Catherine Rottenberg. "Postfeminism, popular feminism and neoliberal feminism? Sarah Banet-Weiser, Rosalind Gill and Catherine Rottenberg in conversation." Feminist Theory, vol. 21, no. 1, 2020, pp. 3-24.

Banet-Weiser, Sarah. Authentic TM: The Politics of Ambivalence in a Brand Culture. NYU

Press, 2012.

Barker, Chris, and Dariusz Galasiński. *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. Sage Publications, 2007.

Baumgardner, Jennifer, and Amy Richards. *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000.

Baxter, Judith. *Positioning Gender in Discourse: A Feminist Methodology*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Berg, Eiki. "Where East Meets the West? Baltic States in Search of New Identity." *Regions in Central and Eastern Europe: Past and Present,* edited by Tadayuki Hayashi and Fukuda Hiroshi. Slavic Research Centre, 2007, pp. 49-67.

Billig, Michael, Susan Condor, Derek Edwards, Mike Gane, David Middleton, Alan Radley. *Ideological Dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking.* Sage Publications, 1998.

Billig, Michael. *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology.* Sage Publications, 1991.

Birmontienė, Toma, and Virginija Jurėnienė. "Development of Women's Rights in Lithuania: Recognition of Women's Political Rights." *Jurisprudencija,* vol. 116, no. 2, 2009, pp. 2029-2058.

Bodenhorn, Barbara, and Gabriele vom Bruck. "'Entangled in Histories': An Introduction to the Anthropology of Names and Naming." *An Anthropology of Names and Naming*, edited by Gabriele Vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, pp. 1–30.

Booth, Alison, Andrew Leigh, and Elena Varganova. "Does Ethnic Discrimination Vary Across Minority Groups? Evidence from a Field Experiment." *Oxford Bulletin of*

Economics and Statistics, vol. 74, no. 4, 2011.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* Routledge, 2013.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and John B. Thompson. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1991.

Boxer, Diana, and Elena Gritsenko. "Women and Surnames Across Cultures: Reconstituting Identity in Marriage." *Women and Language,* vol. 28, no. 2, 2005, pp. 1-11.

Brown, Wendy. "Sacrificial Citizenship: Neoliberalism, Human Capital, and Austerity Politics." *Constellations,* vol. 23, no. 1, 2016.

Bruner, Jerome and David A. Kalmar, "Narrative and metanarrative in the construction of Self." *Self-awareness: Its Nature and Development,* edited by Michel Ferrari and Robert J. Sternberg, The Guilford Press, 1998, pp. 308-332.

Bucholtz, Mary. "Theories of Discourse as Theories of Gender: Discourse Analysis in Language and Gender Studies." edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003, pp. 43-69.

Budgeon, Shelley. "Individualized femininity and feminist politics of choice." *European Journal of Women's Studies,* vol. 23, no. 3, 2015, pp. 303-318.

Budgeon, Shelley. "Couple Culture and the Production of Singleness." *Sexualities,* vol. 11, no. 3, 2008, pp. 301-325.

Brooks, Meegan. "For Nontraditional Names' Sake: A Call to Reform the Name-Change Process for Marrying Couples", University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform, vol. 47, no. 1, 2013.

Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution." *The Twentieth-Century Performance Reader,* edited by Michael Huxley and Noel Witts, 1998, pp. 120-135.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* Routledge, 1990.

Butler, Jess. “For White Girls Only? Post-Feminism and the Politics of Inclusion.” *Feminist Formations* , vol. 25, no. 1, 2013, pp. 35–58.

Cairns, Kate, and Josee Johnston. “Choosing health: embodied neoliberalism, postfeminism, and the ‘do-diet’.” *Theory and Society,* vol. 44, 2015, pp. 152-175.

Cameron, Deborah. “Gender and Language Ideologies.” *The Handbook of Language and Gender,* edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003, pp. 447-467.

Cameron, Deborah. *Feminism and Linguistic Theory.* Palgrave, 1992 [2nd edition].

Caplan, Jane. “‘This or That Particular Person’: Protocols of Identification in Nineteenth-Century Europe.” *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey. Princeton UP, 2001, pp. 49-67.

Castrén, Anna−Maija. “Becoming “Us”: Marital Name, Gender, and Agentic Work in Transition to Marriage.” *Journal of Marriage and Family,* vol. 81, no. 1, 2018, pp. 248-263.

Carter, Julia. “Women (Not) Troubling ‘The Family’: Exploring Women’s Narratives of Gendered Family Practices.” *Journal of Family Issues,* vol. 60, no. 6, 2019, pp. 2264-2287.

Clark, Terry D. “Nationalism in post-soviet Lithuania: New approaches for the nation of "innocent sufferers.” *After Independence: Making and Protecting the Nation in Postcolonial and Postcommunist States,* edited by Lowell W. Barrington, University of Michigan Press, 2006, pp. 162-186.

Clarke, Victoria, Maree Burns, and Carole Burgoyne. “‘Who would take whose name?’ Accounts of naming practices in same−sex relationships.” *Journal of Community &*

Applied Social Psychology, vol. 18, no. 5, 2008, pp. 420-439.

Clifton, Jonathan. "What's in a name? Names, national identity, assimilation, and the new racist discourse of Marine Le Pen." *Pragmatics,* vol. 23, no. 3, 2013, pp. 403-430.

Colebrook, Claire. "Introduction." *Feminist Theory,* vol. 7, no. 2, 2006, pp. 131-142.

Coleman, Rebecca, and Mónica Moreno Figueroa. "Past and Future Perfect? Beauty, Affect and Hope." *Journal for Cultural Research,* vol. 14, no. 4, 2010, pp. 357-373.

Coltrane, Scott. "Research on Household Labor: Modelling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family Work." *Journal of Marriage and Family,* vol. 62, no. 4, 2000, pp. 1208-1233.

Daukšas, Darius. "The Transmission of Ethnicity: Family and State - A Lithuanian Perspective." *Race, Ethnicity and Nation,* edited by Peter Wade, Bergham Books, 2007, pp. 145-169.

Davies, Hayley. "Sharing Surnames: Children, Family and Kinship." *Sociology,* vol. 45, no. 5, 2011, pp. 554-569.

Denzin, Norman K. "Foreword. Narrative's moment." *Lines of Narrative: Psychosocial Perspectives,* edited by Molly Andrews, Shelley Day Sclater, Corinne Squire, and Amal Treacher. Routledge, 2000.

De Stefani, Elwys. "Names and Discourse." *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming,* edited by Carole Hough, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 52-69.

DiGregorio, Nikki. "Same-Sex Marriage Policies and Lesbian Family Life." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy,* vol. 13, 2016, pp. 58-72.

Donaghue, Ngaire. "Seriously Stylish: Academic Femininities and the Politics of Feminism and Fashion in Academia." *Aesthetic labour: Beauty politics in neoliberalism,* edited by Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill, Christina Scharff, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp.

231-247.

Donskis, Leonidas. *Identity and Freedom: Mapping Nationalism and Social Criticism in Twentieth-century Lithuania,* Routledge, 2002.

Dosekun, Simidele. "For Western Girls Only?: Post-feminism as transnational culture." *Feminist Media Studies,* vol. 15, no. 6, 2015, pp. 960-975.

Edley, Nigel. "Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions." *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis,* edited by Margareth Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon J. Yates, Sage Publications, 2001, pp. 189-229.

Edwards, Derek. "Interpretative Repertoire." *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods,* edited by Michael S. Lewis-Beck, Alan Bryman, and Tim Futing Liao, 2011, p. 507 [online source. Accessed March 11, 2020]

Eichner, Carolyn J. "In the Name of the Mother: Feminist Opposition to the Patronym in the Nineteenth-Century France." *Signs,* vol. 39, no. 3, 2014, pp. 659-683.

Elias, Ana, Rosalind Gill, and Christina Scharff. "Aesthetic labour: Beauty politics in neoliberalism." *Aesthetic labour: Beauty politics in neoliberalism,* edited by Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill, Christina Scharff, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 3-49.

Elias, Norbert, and Michael Schröter. *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Emens, Elizabeth F. "Changing Name Changing: Framing Rules and the Future of Marital Names." *The University of Chicago Law Review,* vol. 74, no. 3, 2007, pp. 761-863.

Eshleman, Amy, and Jean Halley. "Self-Identified Feminist Mothers' Naming Preferences for Their Children: Accepting Being 'as Feminist as Everyone' Else." *Women's Studies,* vol. 25, 2016, pp. 215-229.

Evans, Adrienne, and Sarah Riley. "The Entrepreneurial Practices of Becoming a Doll." *Aesthetic labour: Beauty politics in neoliberalism,* edited by Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill, Christina Scharff, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 133-149.

Fahrmeir, Andreas. "Governments and Forgers: Passports in Nineteenth-Century Europe." *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey. Princeton UP, 2001, pp. 218-235.

Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War against American Women.* Three Rivers Press, 2006. [2nd edition]

Favaro, Laura, and Rosalind Gill. "'Pump up the subjectivity': Neoliberalism, affective entrepreneurship and the victimhood/agency debate." *Re-writing Women as Victims: From Theory to Practice,* edited by María José Gámez Fuentes, Sonia Núñez Puente, Emma Gómez Nicolau Routledge, 2019.

Finch, Janet. "Naming Names: Kinship, Individuality and Personal Names." *Sociology,* vol. 42, no. 4, 2008, pp. 709-725.

Forber, Gordon B., Leah E. Adams-Curtis, Kay B. White, and Nicole R. Hamm. "Perceptions of Married Women and Married Men With Hyphenated Surnames." *Sex Roles,* vol. 46, nos. 5/6, 2002, 167-175.

Foss, Karen A., and Belle A. Edson. "What's in a name? Accounts of married women's name choices." *Western Journal of Speech Communication,* vol. 53, no. 4, 1989, pp. 356-373.

Foucault, Michel. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault,* edited by University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Fraser, Nancy. "Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History." *New Left Review*, vol. 56, pp. 97-117.

Freeman, Mark. "Afterword: 'Even amidst' - Rethinking narrative coherence." *Beyond Narrative Coherence/ Studies in Narrative 11*, edited by Matti Hyvärinen, Lars-Christer Hydén, Marja Saarenheimo, and Maria Tamboukou, John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2010, pp. 167-187.

Garšva, Kazimieras. "Lietuvos moterų nepriesaginės (latviškos darybos) pavardės" [Lithuanian women's surnames (of Latvian word-formation) without suffixes]. *Kalbos kultūra,* 2012, p. 216-224.

Ghodsee, Kristen. „Feminism-by-design: Emerging Capitalism, Cultural Feminism, and Women's Nongovernmental Organizations in Postsocialist Europe." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2004, pp. 727-753.

Gibbon, Margaret. *Feminist Perspectives on Language.* Routledge, 2019.

Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Polity, 1991.

Gill, Rosalind, and Shani Orgad. "The Amazing Bounce-Backable Woman: Resilience and the Psychological Turn in Neoliberalism." *Sociological Research Online,* vol. 23, no. 2, 2018, pp. 477-495.

Gill, Rosalind. "The affective, cultural and psychic life of postfeminism: A postfeminist sensibility 10 years on." *European Journal of Cultural Studies,* vol. 20, no. 6, 2017, pp. 606-626.

Gill, Rosalind. "Post-postfeminism?: new feminist visibilities in postfeminist times." *Feminist media studies,* vol. 16, no. 4, 2016, pp. 610-630.

Gill, Rosalind, and Christina Scharff. "Introduction." *New femininities: Postfeminism, neoliberalism and subjectivity,* edited by Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff, Springer, 2013, pp. 1-17.

Gill, Rosalind. "Culture and subjectivity in neoliberal and postfeminist times." *Subjectivity,* vol. 25, no. 1, 2008, pp. 432-445.

Gill, Rosalind. "Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a sensibility." *European journal of cultural studies,* vol. 10, no. 2. 2007, pp. 147-166.

Geselle, Andrea. "Domenica Saba Takes to the Road: Origins and Development of a Modern Passport System in Lombardy-Veneto." *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World*, edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey. Princeton UP, 2001, pp. 199-218.

Gerhards, Jürgen, and Silke Hans. "From Hasan to Herbert: Name−Giving Patterns of Immigrant Parents between Acculturation and Ethnic Maintenance." *American Journal of Sociology,* vol. 114, no. 4, 2009, pp. 1102-1128.

Glasgow, Gregory Paul and Jeremie Bouchard. "Introduction." *Researching Agency in Language Policy and Planning,* edited by Gregory Paul Glasgow and Jeremia Bouchard, Routledge, 2018.

Goldin, Claudia, and Maria Shim. "Making a name: Women's Surnames at Marriage and Beyond." *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* vol. 18, no. 2, 2004, pp. 143-160.

Gooding, Gretchen E, and Rose M. Kreider. "Women's Marital Choices in a Nationally Representative Sample." *Journal of Family Issues,* vol. 31, no. 5, 2009, pp. 681-701.

Gregor, Aniko, and Weronika Grzebalska. "Thoughts on the contested relationship between neoliberalism and feminism." *Solidarity in Struggle: Feminist Perspectives on Neoliberalism in East-Central Europe*, edited by Eszter Kováts, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2016, pp. 11-21.

Grewal, Inderpal. "The Transnational in Feminist Research: Concept and Approaches." *Mehrheit am Rand? Geschlechterverhältnisse, globale Ungleichheit und*

transnationale Handlungsansätze, edited by Heike Brabandt, Bettina Roß, and Susanne Zwingel, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2008, pp. 189-199.

Guthman, Julie. "Fast food/organic food: Reflexive tastes and the making of 'yuppie chow'." *Social & Cultural Geography,* vol. 4, no. 1, 2003, pp. 45-58.

Hall, Stuart. "The Neo-liberal Revolution." *Cultural Studies,* 2011, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 705-728.

Hämäläinen, Lasse. "User Names in the Online Gaming Community Playforia." *Names in the Economy: Cultural Prospects,* edited by Paula Sjöblom, Terhi Ainiala and Ulla Hakala, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013, pp. 214-232.

Hamilton, Laura, Claudia Geist, and Brian Powell. "Marital Name Change as a Window into Gender Attitudes." *Gender & Society*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2011, pp. 145-75.

Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism,* Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hlubinková, Zuzana. "Poznámka k přechylování příjmení v současné češtině." [A Note on the Feminization of Surnames in Contemporary Czech] *Acta Onomastica*, vol. 55, 2016, pp. 118-120.

Hoffnung, Michele. "What's In a Name? Marital Name Choice Revisited." *Sex Roles,* 58, 2006, pp. 817-825.

Hogan, Susan. "'Age is Just a Number, Init?': Interrogating Perceptions of Age and Women within Social Gerontology." *Women's Studies,* vol. 45, no. 1, 2016, pp. 57-77.

Hough, Carole. "Introduction." *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming,* edited by Carole Hough, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 1-17.

Hyden, Lars-Christen. "Bodies, embodiment and stories." *Doing Narrative Research,* edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire, and Maria Tamboukou, Sage Publications, 2013, pp. 126-142.

Hyvärinen, Matti, Lars-Christer Hydén, Marja Saarenheimo, and Maria Tamboukou. "Beyond Narrative Coherence: An Introduction." *Beyond Narrative Coherence/ Studies in Narrative 11*, edited by Matti Hyvärinen, Lars-Christer Hydén, Marja Saarenheimo, and Maria Tamboukou, John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2010, pp. 1-17.

Hyvärinen, Matti. "*Analysing Narratives and Storytelling*". *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods,* edited by Pertti Alasuutari, Leonard Bickman, and Julia Brannen, Sage Publications, 2008, pp. 447–460.

Ingold, Tim, and Gisli Palsson. *Biosocial Becomings: Integrating Social and Biological Anthropology.* Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Issoupova, Olga. "From Duty to Pleasure? Motherhood in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia." *Gender, State and Society in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia*, edited by Sarah Ashwin, Routledge, 2000, pp. 30-55.

Jankauskaitė, Margarita. "25 years of liberty or neoliberalization in Lithuania? Feminist responses to uncomfortable questions." *Solidarity in Struggle: Feminist Perspectives on Neoliberalism in East-Central Europe*, edited by Eszter Kováts, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2016, pp. 102-108.

Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Jermyn, Deborah. "'Get a life, ladies. Your old one is not coming back': ageing, ageism and the lifespan of female celebrity." *Celebrity Studies,* vol. 3, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1-12.

Johnson, David Cassels, and Eric J. Johnson. "Power and Agency in Language Policy Appropriation." *Language Policy,* vol. 14, no. 3, 2015, pp. 221-243.

Johnson, David R., and Laurie K. Scheuble. "Women's Marital Naming in Two Generations: A National Study." *Journal of Marriage and Family,* vol. 57, no. 3, 1995, pp.

724-732.

Johnson, David R., and Laurie K. Scheuble. "What should we call our kids? Choosing children's surnames when parent's last names differ." *The Social Science Journal,* vol. 39, no. 3, 2002, pp. 419-429.

Jones, Lucy, Sara Mills, Laura L. Peterson, Georgina Turner, and Laura Coffey-Glocer. "Identity and naming practices in British marriage and civil partnerships." *Gender and Language,* vol. 11, no. 3, 2017.

JongMi Kim, "Is 'the Missy' a New Femininity?" *New femininities: Postfeminism, neoliberalism and subjectivity,* edited by Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff, Springer, 2013, pp. 147-161.

Jūrėnienė, Virginija. "Lithuanian Family - a Hearth of the Unarmed Resistance against the Soviet Occupation." *Studia Podlaskie,* vol. 24, 2016, pp. 259-293.

Jūrėnienė, Virginija. "Gender Roles in Lithuanian Society." *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, vol. 10. No. 6, 2010, pp: 2-7. [https://globaljournals.org/GJHSS_Volume10/1-Gender-Roles-in-Lithuanian-Society.pdf]

Kačkutė, Eglė. "Mothering in a foreign language: Silent and/or multilingual mothers in Dalia Staponkutė's *The Silence of the Mothers.*" *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 52, 2015, pp. 82-91.

Kanai, Akane. "WhatShouldWeCallMe? Self-Branding, Individuality and Belonging in Youthful Femininities on Tumblr." *M/C Journal,* vol. 18, no. 1, 2015.

Kangas, Anni, and Suvi Salmenniemi. "Decolonizing knowledge: neoliberalism beyond the three worlds." *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory,* vol. 17, no. 2, 2016, pp. 210-227.

Kay, Rebecca. *Men in Contemporary Russia: The Fallen Heroes of Post-Soviet Change?*,

Ashgate Publishing, 2006.

Keels, Megan M., and Rebecca S. Powers. "Marital Name Changing: Delving Deeper into Women's Reasons." *Advances in Applied Sociology,* vol. 3, no. 7, 2013, pp. 301-306.

Kelertas, Violeta. "Baltic Postcolonialism and its Critics." *Baltic Postcolonialism,* edited by Violeta Kelertas, Rodopi, 2006, pp. 1-9.

Kerns, Myleah Y. "North American Women's Surname Choice Based on Ethnicity and Self-Identification as Feminists." *Names,* vol. 59, no. 2, 2011, pp. 104-117.

Khosravi, Shahram. "White masks.Muslim names: immigrants and name-changing in Sweden." *Race and Class,* vol. 53, no. 3, 2011, pp. 65-80.

Kline, Susan L., Laura Stafford, Jill C. Miklosovic. "Women's Surnames: Decisions, Interpretations and Associations with Relational Qualities." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,* vol. 13, no. 4, 1996, pp. 593-617.

Kolbešnikova, Viktorija. "Post-feminism in post-socialist Lithuania: *Soviet Woman* becomes *Woman.*" 2019, Central European University, MA thesis.

Kopelman, Richard J., Rita J. Shea-Van Fossen, Eletherios Paraskevas, Leanna Lawter, and David J. Prottas. "The Bride is Keeping her Name: A 35-Year Retrospective Analysis of Trends and Correlates." *Social Behavior and Personality,* vol. 35, no. 5, 2009, pp. 687-700.

Kováts, Eszter. "Preface: Overcoming false dichotomies – Reclaiming feminist politics in a neoliberal age." *Solidarity in Struggle: Feminist Perspectives on Neoliberalism in East-Central Europe*, edited by Eszter Kováts, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2016, pp. 5-11.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, (trans. Leon S. Roudiez), New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Kuhn, Elisabeth D. "Rethinking Ms." *Women and Language*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2007.

Kurvet-Käosaar, Leena. "'Not Much Love Lost between Me and My Husband': Love in Estonian Women's Life-Stories of the Soviet Period." *The Soviet Past in the Post-Socialist Present: Methodology and Ethics in Russian, Baltic and Central European Oral History and Memory Studies*, edited by Melanie Ilic and Dalia Leinarte, Routledge, 2015, pp. 110-129.

LaFont, Suzanne. "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: Women in the Post-Communist States." Communist and Post-Communist Studies, vol. 34, no. 2, 2001, pp. 203–220.

Lalvani, Priya. "Constructing the (m)Other." *Narrative Inquiry*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2011, pp. 276–293.

Laskowski, Kara A. "Women's Post-Marital Name Retention and the Communication of Identity." *Names,* vol. 58, no. 2, 2010, pp. 75-89.

Lawler, Steph. "Stories and the Social World." *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, edited by Michael Pickering, Edinburgh University Press, 2008, pp. 32-50.

Layne, Linda. "'Your Child Deserves a Name': Possessive Individualism and the Politics of Memory in Pregnancy Loss." *The Anthropology of Names and Naming,* edited by Gabriele Vom Bruck and Barbara Bodenhorn, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 31-50.

Lazar, Michelle M. "'Seriously Girly Fun!': Recontextualizing Aesthetic Labour as Fun and Play in Cosmetics Advertising." Aesthetic labour: Beauty politics in neoliberalism, edited by Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill, Christina Scharff, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 51-66.

LeBesco, Kathleen. "Neoliberalism, public health, and the moral perils of fatness." *Critical Public Health,* vol. 21, no. 2, 2011, pp. 153-164.

LeCompte, Margaret, and Jean J. Schensul. *Analyzing and Interpreting Ethnographic Data*, AltaMira Press, 1999.

Leinartė, Dalia. "Nationalism and family ideology: The case of Lithuania at the turn of the 20th century." *The History of the Family,* vol. 11, no. 2, 2006, pp. 81-92.

Lieberson, Stanley. *A Matter of Taste: How Names, Fashions, and Culture Change.* Yale University Press, 2000.

Lindsay, Jo, and Deborah Dempsey. "First names and social distinction: Middle-class naming practices in Australia." *Journal of Sociology,* vol. 53, no. 3, 2017, pp. 577-591.

Liss, Miriam, and Mindy J. Erchull. "Differences in Beliefs and Behaviors Between Feminist Actual and Anticipated Mothers." *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* vol. 37, no. 3, 2013, pp. 381-391.

Litosseliti, Lia, Rosalind Gill and Laura Garcia Favaro. "Postfeminism as a critical tool for gender and language study." *Gender and Language,* vol. 13, no. 1, 2019.

Loots, Gerrit, Kathleen Coppens, and Jasmina Sermijn. "Practicing a rhizomatic perspective in narrative research." *Doing Narrative Research,* edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire, and Maria Tamboukou, Sage Publications, 2013, pp. 108-126.

Maciejauskienė, Vitalija. "Dėl lietuvių pavardžių vertinimo darybos požiūriu." *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica,* vol. 44, 2001, 167-187.

Maciejauskienė, Vitalija. *Lietuvių pavardžių susidarymas XIII-XVIII a. [The Formation of Lithuanian Surnames.* 13th - 18th Centuries]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1991.

Madziva, Roda. "'Your name does not tick the box': the intertwining of names, bodies, religion and nationality in the construction of identity within the UK asylum system." *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* vol. 41, no. 5, 2018, pp. 938-957.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. "'What's in a Name?' Social Labelling and Gender Practices." *The Handbook of Language and Gender,* edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2003, pp. 69-98.

MacEacheron, Melanie. "North American Women's Marital Surname Change: Practices, Law, and Patrilineal Descent Reckoning." *Evolutionary Psychological Science,* vol. 2, 2016, pp. 149-161.

MacKinnon, Danny, and Kate Driscoll Derickson. "From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of resilience policy and activism." Progress in Human Geography, vol. 37, no. 2, 2012, 253-270.

Maclean, Marie. *Name of the Mother: Writing Illegitimacy.* Routledge, 2003.

Maclean, Marie. "The Performance of Illegitimacy: Signing the Matronym." *New Literary History,* vol. 25, no. 1, 1994, pp. 95-107.

Madziva, Roda. "'Your name does not tick the box': the intertwining of names, bodies, religion and nationality in the construction of identity within the UK asylum system." *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* vol. 41, no. 5, 2018, pp. 938-957.

Mansker, Andrea. "Vive 'Mademoiselle'!' the Politics of Singleness in Early Twentieth-Century French Feminism." *Feminist Studies,* vol. 33, no. 3, 2007, pp. 632-658.

Marcinkevičienė, Dalia. *Lietuvių šeimos ideologijos: nuo XIX a. tradicijos ir nacionalizmo iki sovietinės šeimos politikos 1944–1970 m.* Habilitacijos procedūrai teikiamų mokslo darbų apžvalga, Vilnius, 2009.

Martínez-Jiménez, Laura, Lina Gálvez-Muñoz, and Ángela Solano-Caballero. "Neoliberalism Goes Pop and Purple: Postfeminist Empowerment from Beyoncé to Mad Max." *The Journal of Popular Culture,* vol. 51, no. 2, 2018.

Massumi, Brian. *Politics of Affect.* John Wiley and Sons, 2015.

Malešević, Siniša. "The Chimera of National Identity." *Nations and Nationalism* 17.2 (2011): 272-90. Print.

McAvoy, Jean. "From Ideology to Feeling: Discourse, Emotion, and an Analytic Synthesis." *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2015, pp. 22-33.

McNay, Lois. "Gender and narrative identity." *Journal of Political Ideologies,* vol. 4, no. 3, 1999a, pp. 315-336.

McNay, Lois. "Subject, Psyche and Agency. The work of Judith Butler." *Theory, Culture and Society,* vol. 16, no. 2, 1999b, pp. 175-193.

McKinley, R. A. *A History of British Surnames*. London: Longman, 1990.

McRobbie, Angela. "Feminism, the Family and the New 'Mediated' Maternalism." *New Formations*, vol. 80, no. 80, 2013, pp. 119–137.

McRobbie, Angela. *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*. Sage Publications, 2009.

Mikonytė, Dalia. "XXI a. Kūrėjos tapatybės problema: tarp ženklų ir tikrovės." [Identity problem of a 21th-century female artist: between signs and reality] (Unpublished master thesis). 2013. Vilniaus Dailės Akademija, Vilnius.

Miliūnaitė Rita. *Ką Manote Apie Nepriesagines moterų Pavardes?* [What do you think about non-suffixed female surnames?] Lietuvių Kalbos Institutas, 2013.

Mills, Sarah. "Caught Between Sexism, Anti-sexism and `Political Correctness': Feminist Women's Negotiations with Naming Practices." *Discourse & Society,* vol. 14, no. 1, 2003, pp. 87-110.

Mills, Sara, and Louise Mullany. *Language, Gender and Feminism: Theory, Methodology and Practice.* Routledge, 2011.

Moore, David Chioni. "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a

Global Postcolonial Critique." PMLA, vol. 116, no. 1, 2001, pp. 111–128.

Murray, Thomas E. "Attitudes Toward Married Women's Surnames: Evidence from the American Midwest." *Names,* vol. 45, no. 3, 1997, pp. 163-183.

Noack, Turid, and Kenneth Aarskaug Wiik. "Women's Choice of Surname Upon Marriage in Norway." *Journal of Marriage and Family,* vol. 70, no. 2, 2008, pp. 507 - 518.

Nowakowska, Maria Magdalena. *"Na co komu -owa (-ová/-ova/-eva), czyli o nazwiskach (i nie tylko) żeńskich w wybranych językach słowiańskich."* [What to whom: -owa (-ová/-ova/-eva), about the women's last names (and not only) in the selected Slavonic languages] *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN,* LXII, 2016, pp. 71-79.

Nugent, Colleen. "Children's Surnames, Moral Dilemmas: Accounting for the Predominance of Father's Surnames for Children." *Gender and Society,* vol. 24, no. 4, 2010, pp. 499-525.

Occhipinti, Laurie. "Two steps back? Anti-feminism in Eastern Europe." *Anthropology Today,* vol. 12, no. 6, 1996, pp. 13-18.

Oksala, Johanna. "The Neoliberal Subject of Feminism." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology,* vol. 42, no. 1, 2011 pp. 104-120.

Omi, Leissner. "Naming the Unheard of." *National Black Law Journal*, vol. 15, no. 1, 1997.

Ong, Aihwa. "Neoliberalism as a Mobile Technology." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* vol. 32, no. 1, 2007, pp. 3-8.

Ong, Aihwa. *Neoliberalism as exception: mutations in citizenship and sovereignty,* Duke University Press, 2006.

Orgad, Sani, and Sara De Benedictis. "The 'stay-at-home' mother, postfeminism and neoliberalism: Content analysis of UK news coverage." *European Journal of Communication,* vol. 30, no. 4, 2015, pp. 418-436.

Palsson, Gisli. "Personal Names. Embodiment, Differentiation, Exclusion, and Belonging." *Science, Technology, & Human Values,* vol. 39, no. 4, 2014, pp. 618-630.

Peters, Eleonor. "The Influence of Choice Feminism on Women's and Men's Attitudes towards Name Changing at Marriage: An Analysis of Online Comments on UK Social Media." *Names,* vol. 66, no. 3, 2018, pp. 176-185.

Petterson, Charlotte J., and Rachel H. Farr. "What Shall We Call Ourselves? Last Names Among Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Couples and Their Adopted Children." *Journal of GLBT Family Studies,* vol. 13, no. 2, 2017, pp. 97-113.

Phipps, Alison. *The Politics of the Body: Gender in a Neoliberal and Neoconservative Age.* John Wiley and Sons, 2014.

Phoenix, Ann. "Analysing narrative context." *Doing Narrative Research,* edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire, and Maria Tamboukou, Sage Publications, 2013, pp. 72-88.

Pina-Cabral, João De. "The Truth of Personal Names." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute,* vol. 16, no. 2, 2010, pp. 297–312.

Pickering, Michael. "Experience and the Social World." *Research Methods for Cultural Studies*, edited by Michael Pickering, Edinburgh University Press, 2008, pp. 17-31.

Pilcher, Jane. "Names and "doing gender": How forenames and surnames contribute to gender identities, difference, and inequalities." *Sex roles,* vol. 77, no.11-12, 2017, pp. 812-822.

Pilcher, Jane. "Names, bodies, and identities." *Sociology,* vol. 50, no. 4, 2016, pp. 764-779.

Pitre, Nicole Y., Kaysi E. Kushner, Kim D. Raine, and Kathy M. Hegadoren. "Critical Feminist Narrative Inquiry." *Advances in Nursing Science,* vol. 36, no. 2, 2013, pp. 118-32.

Plakans, Andrejs and Charles Wetherell. "Patrilines, surnames, and family identity: A Case

Study From the Russian Baltic Provinces in the Nineteenth Century." *The History of the Family*, 2000, vol. 5, no. 2, 2000, pp. 199-214.

Pomerantz, Shauna, and Rebecca Raby. "'Oh, she's so smart': girls' complex engagements with post/feminist narratives of academic success." *Gender and Education*, vol. 23, no. 5, 2011, pp. 549-564.

Qi, Xiaoying. "Neo-traditional child surnaming in contemporary China: Women's rights as veiled patriarchy." *Sociology,*

Račevskis, Kārlis. "Toward a postcolonial perspective on the Baltic states." *Journal of Baltic Studies,* vol. 33, no. 1, 2007, pp. 37-56.

Ragauskaitė, Alma. *XVI-XVIII a. Kauniečių asmenvardžiai* [*The anthroponymy of Kaunas inhabitants of the 16-18th century*]. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2005.

Ragussis, Michael. *Acts of Naming: the Family Plot in Fiction*. Oxford University Press, 1986.

Raila, Eligijus, and Paulius Subačius. "Language Standardization and Forms of Ideological Education." *Lituanus. The Lithuanian Quarterly Journal of Arts and Sciences*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2012, pp. 18–30.

Ramonienė, Meilutė. "Language Planning and Personal Naming in Lithuania." *Current Issues in Language Planning,* vol. 8, no. 3, 2007, pp. 422-436.

Ratilainen, Saara. "Business for Pleasure: Elite Women in the Russian Popular Media." *Rethinking Class in Russia*, edited by Salmenniemi, Suvi, Routledge, 2016, pp. 45–65.

Reynolds, Jill, Margaret Wetherell, and Stephanie Taylor. "Choice and chance: negotiating agency in narratives of singleness." *The Sociological Review,* vol. 55, no. 2, 2007, pp. 331-351.

Reynolds, Jill, and Stephanie Taylor. "Narrating singleness: Life stories and deficit

identities." *Narrative Inquiry,* vol. 15, no. 2, 2004, pp. 197-215.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Narrative Identity." *Philosophy Today,* Vol. 35, No. 1, 1991, pp. 73-81.

Riessman, Catherine K. *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences.* Sage Publications, 2008.

Ringrose, Jessica, and Valerie Walkerdine. "Regulating The Abject: The TV make-over as site of neo-liberal reinvention toward bourgeois femininity." *Feminist Media Studies,* vol. 8, no. 3, 2008, pp. 227-246.

Robnett, Rachael D., Marielle Wertheimer, and Harriet R. Tenenbaum. "Does a Woman's Marital Surname Choice Influence Perceptions of Her Husband? An Analysis Focusing on Gender-Typed Traits and Relationship Power Dynamics." *Sex Roles,* vol. 79, 2018, pp. 59-71.

Robnett, Rachael D. "Overcoming Functional Fixedness in Naming Traditions: A Commentary on Pilcher's Names and 'Doing Gender'." *Sex Roles,* vol. 77, 2017, pp. 823-828.

Robnett, Rachael D., Carrie R. Underwood, Paul A. Nelson, and Kristin J. Anderson. "'She Might be Afraid of Commitment': Perceptions of Women Who Retain Their Surname After Marriage." *Sex Roles,* vol. 75, 2016, pp. 500-513.

Robnett, Rachael D., and Campbell Leaper. "'Girls Don't Propose! Ew.': A Mixed-Methods Examination of Marriage Tradition Preferences and Benevolent Sexism in Emerging Adults." *Journal of Adolescent Research,* vol. 28, no. 1, 2013, pp. 96-121.

Rom, Michal, and Orly Benjamin. *Feminism, Family, and Identity in Israel: Women's Marital Names*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Rose, Nikolas. *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self,* Free Association Books, 1999.

Rottenberg, Catherine. "The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism." *Cultural Studies,* vol. 28, no. 3, 2014, pp. 418-437.

Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic of Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." *Towards an Anthropology of Women,* edited by Rayna R. Reiter. Monthly Review Press, 1975, pp. 157-210.

Salmenniemi, Suvi, and Maria Adamson. "New Heroines of Labour: Domesticating Post-feminism and Neoliberal Capitalism in Russia." *Sociology,* vol. 49, no. 1, 2015, pp. 88-105.

Salumets, Thomas. "Conflicted Consciousness: Jaan Kaplinski and the Legacy of Intra-European Postcolonialism in Estonia." *Baltic Postcolonialism,* edited by Violeta Kelertas, Rodopi, 2006, pp. 429-445.

Scharff, Christina. "The Psychic Life of Neoliberalism: Mapping the Contours of Entrepreneurial Subjectivity." *Theory, Culture and Society,* vol. 33, no. 6, 2015, pp. 107-122.

Scheuble, Laurie K, David R. Johnson, and Kathrine M. Johnson. "Marital name changing attitudes and plans of college students: comparing change over time and across regions." *Sex Roles,* vol. 66. 2012, pp. 282-292.

Scheuble, Laurie K, and Johnson David R. "Marital Name Change: Plans and Attitudes of College Students." *Journal of Marriage and Family,* vol. 55, no. 3, 1993, pp. 747-754.

Scott, James C., John Tehranian, and Jeremy Mathias. "The Production of Legal Identities Proper to States: The Case of the Permanent Family Surname." *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* vol. 44, no. 1, 2002, pp. 4-44. Print.

Seale, Clive. "Resurrective practice and narrative." *The Uses of Narrative: Explorations in Sociology, Psychology, and Cultural Studies,* edited by Molly Andrews, Transaction,

2004, pp. 36-48.

Seale, Clive. *Constructing Death: The Sociology of Dying and Bereavement*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Shadrina, Anna. "Narrating Gender Order: Why do Older Single Women in Russia Say That They Do Not Want to Be in Relationships with Men?" *Gender and Choice after Socialism*, edited by Lynne Attwood, Schimpfössl Elisabeth, Marina Yusupova, Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, pp. 81-109.

Shilling, Chris. "Physical capital and situated action: a new direction for a corporeal sociology." *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* vol. 25, no. 4, 2004, pp. 473-487.

Skey, Michael. "Identity as Ideology: Understanding Ethnicity and Nationalism by Siniša Malešević." *Nations and Nationalism* 13.4 (2007): 740-41. Print.

Skeggs, Beverley. *Class, Self, Culture,* Routledge, 2004.

Sloboda, Marian, Lucia Molnár Satinská, and Mira Nábělková. "Language planning in Slovakia: Nation-building in the context of European integration." *Language Planning in the Post-Communist Era: The Struggles for Language Control in the New Order in Eastern Europe, Eurasia and China*, edited by Ernest Andrews, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 261–286.

Slovenko, Ralph. "Overview: Names and the Law." Names 32, no. 2 (1984): 107-13.

Smith, Sidonie. "Performativity, Autobiographical Practice, Resistance." *a/b: Auto/Biography Studies*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1995, pp. 17–33.

Snyder, Kelly. "All Names Are Not Equal: Choice of Marital Surname and Equal Protection." *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy,* vol. 30, 2009, pp. 561-587.

Speer, Susan, and Jonathan Potter. "From Performatives to Practices: Judith Butler, Discursive Psychology and the Management of Heterosexist Talk." *Talking Gender and Sexuality*, edited by Paul McIlvenny, 2002, pp. 151–181.

Springer, Simon. "Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism." *Critical Discourse Studies,* vol. 9, no. 2, 2012, pp. 133-147.

Stannard, Una. *Mrs. Man.* San Francisco: Germain Books, 1977.

Steinwedel, Charles. "Making Social Groups, One Person at a Time: The Identification of Individuals by Estate, Religious Confession, and Ethnicity in Late Imperial Russia." *Documenting Individual Identity: The Development of State Practices in the Modern World,* edited by Jane Caplan and John Torpey. Princeton UP, 2001, pp. 67-83.

Stoiko, Rachel R., and JoNell Strough. "'Choosing' the Patriarchal Norm: Emerging Adults' Marital Last Name Change Attitudes, Plans, and Rationales." *Gender Issues,* vol. 34, 2017, pp. 295-315.

Suter, Elizabeth A. "Tradition Never Goes Out of Style: The Role of Tradition in Women's Naming Practices." *The Communication Review,* vol. 7, no. 1, 2004, pp. 57-87.

Suter, Elizabeth A., and Ramona F. Oswald. "Do Lesbians Change Their Last Names in the Context of a Committed Relationship?" *Journal of Lesbian Studies,* vol. 7, 2003, pp. 71-83.

Squire, Corinne, Molly Andrews, and Maria Tamboukou. "Introduction: What is narrative research?" *Doing Narrative Research,* edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire, and Maria Tamboukou, Sage Publications, 2013, pp. 1-27.

Squire, Corinne. "From Experience-Centred To Socioculturally-Oriented Approaches to Narrative." *Doing Narrative Research,* edited by Molly Andrews, Corinne Squire, and

Maria Tamboukou, Sage Publications, 2013, pp. 47–71.

Šepetys, Nerijus. "Soviet Authorities, Linguists, and the Standardization of the Lithuanian Language." *Lituanus. The Lithuanian Quarterly Journal of Arts and Sciences*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2012, pp. 5–17.

Tamaševičius, Giedrius. "The role of linguists in metalinguistic discourse in modern Lithuania." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* vol. 37, no. 3, 2016, pp. 243-252.

Taylor, Anthea. *Single Women in Popular Culture: The Limits of Postfeminism,* Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Taylor, Stephanie. "Narrative as construction and discursive resource." *Narrative Inquiry,* vol. 16, no. 1, 2007, pp. 94-102.

Taylor, Stephanie, and Karen Littleton. " Biographies in talk: a narrative-discursive research approach." *Qualitative Sociology Review*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2006, pp. 22–38.

Thornton, Margaret. "The Feminist Fandango with the Legal Academy." *Feminism, Postfeminism and Legal Theory: Beyond the Gendered Subject?* Edited by Dorota Gozdecka and Anne Macduff, Routledge, 2019, pp. 11-29.

Thwaites, Rachel. *Changing Names and Gendering Identity.* Routledge, 2017a.

Thwaites, Rachel. "Making a choice or taking a stand? Choice feminism, political engagement and the contemporary feminist movement." *Feminist Theory,* vol. 18, no. 1, 2017b, pp. 55-68.

Thwaites, Rachel. "The making of selfhood: naming decisions on marriage." *Families, Relationships and Societies,* vol. 2, no. 3, 2013, pp. 425-439.

Tereškinas, Artūras. "Postsocialist gender failures: men in the economies of recognition." *Gendering Postsocialism: Old Legacies and New Hierarchies*, edited by Yulia

Gradskova and Ildikó Asztalos Morell, Routledge, 2018.

Tereškinas, Artūras. "Masculinity Scripts, Good Life and Familial Intentions: The Case of Young Lithuanian Men." *Social Sciences*, vol. 86, no. 4, 2015.

Toyoda, Etsuko, and David Chapman. "Resistance and reform: discourses on marital law in Japan." *Japan Forum,* vol, 29, no. 4, 2017, pp. 470-495.

Trilupaitytė, Skaidra. "Culture or Power Politics? Post-Cold War Anti-Americanism in Russia." *The Political Consequences of Anti-Americanism,* edited by Richard Higgott, Ivona Malbasic, Routledge, 2008, pp. 74-91/

Twenge, Jean M. "'Mrs. His Name': Women's Preferences For Married Names." *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 1997, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 417-429.

Underwood, Carrie R., and Rachel D. Robnett. "I Would Like Us to Share a Name so That We Can Be Recognized in Society.' Marital Surname Preferences in Same-Sex Relationships." *Journal of Homosexuality,* 2019.

Vaicekauskienė, Loreta, and Nerijus Šepetys. "Lithuanian Language Planning: A Battle for Language and Power." Language Planning in the Post-Communist Era, edited by Ernest Andrews, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 193-218.

Vaicekauskienė, Loreta. "Language 'Nationalization': One Hundred Years of Standard Lithuanian." *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*, edited by Tore Kristiansen and Nikolas Coupland, Novus, 2011, pp. 105–112.

Valentová, Iveta. "Vývin prechyľovania ženských priezvisk na slovenskom území." [The Development of the Derivation of Feminine Surnames from Masculine Surnames on the Slovak Territory] *Acta Onomastica,* vol. 54, 2013, pp. 272-292.

Walker, Jeremy, and Melinda Cooper. "Genealogies of resilience: From systems ecology to the political economy of crisis adaptation." *Security Dialogue*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2011, pp.

143-160.

Walkowiak, J.B. *Personal name policy: From theory to practice.* Poznan: Faculty of Modern Languages, Adam Mickiewicz University, 2016.

Watson, Tony J. "Managing Identity: Identity Work, Personal Predicaments and Structural Circumstances." *Organization,* vol. 15, no. 1, 2008, pp: 121-43.

Watson, Tony J. "Narrative, life story and manager identity: A case study in autobiographical identity work." *Human Relations,* vol. 62, no. 3, 2009, pp. 425-452.

Winch, Alison. "Brand Intimacy, Female Friendship and Digital Surveillance Networks." *New Formations,* no. 84/85, 2015, pp. 228-245.

Wilson, Rebekah. *A name of one's own: identity, choice and performance in marital relationships.* PhD thesis, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), 2009.

Wilson, Stephen. *The Means of Naming: A Social and Cultural History of Personal Naming in Western Europe*. London: UCL, 1998. Print.

Weiss, Gail. "The Body as a Narrative Horizon." *Thinking the Limits of the Body,* edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Gail Weiss, State University of New York Press, 2003, pp. 25-39.

Wetherell, Margaret, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates. *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. Sage Publications, 2014.

Wetherell, Margaret. "Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue." *Discourse and Society,* vol. 9, no. 3, 1998, pp. 387-412.

Wetherell, Margaret, and Jonathan Potter. "Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires." *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods,*

edited by Charles Antaki, Sage Publications, 1988, pp. 168-183.

Wheeler, Sara L. "Autoethnographic onomastics: Transdisciplinary scholarship of personal names and 'our-stories'." *Methodological Innovations,* vol. 11, no. 1, 2018a, pp. 1-11.

Wheeler, Sara L. "'Enwau Prydeinig gwyn?' Problematizing the idea of "White British" names and naming practices from a Welsh perspective." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples,* vol. 14, no. 3, 2018b, pp. 251-259.

Wilkinson, Eleonor. "The Romantic Imaginary: Compulsory Coupledom and Single Existence." *Sexualities: Past Reflections, Future Directions,* edited by Sally Hines and Yvette Taylor, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 130-149.

Wood, Martin, and Jon Hales, Susan Purdon, Tanja Sehersen, and Oliver Hayllar. "A Test for Racial Discrimination in Recruitment Practice in British Cities." *Department for Work and Pensions, Research Report No. 607,* her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2009.

Woodiwiss, Jo, Kate Smith, and Kelly Lockwood. "Introduction: Doing Feminist Narrative Research." *Feminist Narrative Research: Opportunities and Challenges,* edited by Jo Woodiwiss, Kate Smith and Kelly Lockwood, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 1-10.

Yanow, Dvora. *Constructing 'Race' and 'Ethnicity' in America: Category-making in Public Policy and Administration*. Routledge, 2015.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. "Situated Intersectionality and the Meanings of Culture." *Consello da Cultura Galega,* 2017. [accessed June 2019 www.consellodacultura.gal/mediateca/extras/Texto_Nira_maquetado.pdf]

Yuval-Davis, Nira. *Gender Nation*. Sage Publications, 1997.

Zhao, Xian, and Monica Biernat. "Your Name Is Your Lifesaver: Anglicization of Names and Moral Dilemmas in a Trilogy of Transportation Accidents." *Social Psychological and Personality Science,* vol. 10, no. 8, 2018, pp. 1011-1018.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. *Lietuvių antroponimika.* [*Lithuanian Anthroponymics*]. Vilnius:

Mokslas, 1977.

Žemienė, Aušra. “Pavardė kultūrinės globalizacijos kontekste: “asmens prekės ženklas” as kalbos paveldo dalis? [Surname in the Context of Cultural Globalization: “Personal Brand” or Part of the Language Heritage] *Logos,* vol. 94, 2017, pp. 179-189.